

ONE- AND TWO-PARTICLE SPECTRAL GAP IDENTITIES FOR THE SYMMETRIC INCLUSION PROCESS AND RELATED MODELS

SEONWOO KIM AND FEDERICO SAU

ABSTRACT. The symmetric inclusion process (SIP) models particles diffusing on a graph with mutual attraction. We recently showed [KS24] that, in the log-concave regime (where diffusivity dominates interaction), the spectral gap of the conservative SIP matches that of a single particle. In this paper, our main result demonstrates that this identity generally fails outside this regime, but always holds for the non-conservative SIP, regardless of the interaction strength. When this one-particle spectral gap identity breaks down, we derive sharp bounds for the gap in terms of diffusivity, and reveal a two-particle spectral gap identity in the vanishing diffusivity limit. Our approach leverages the rigid eigenstructure of SIP, refined comparisons of Dirichlet forms for arbitrary diffusivity and particle numbers, and techniques from slow-fast system analysis. These findings extend to the dual interacting diffusion known as Brownian energy process, and shed some light on the spectral gap behavior for related Dirichlet-reversible systems on general, non-mean-field, geometries.

1. INTRODUCTION

The *symmetric inclusion process* (SIP) is a system of interacting particles hopping on the sites $x, y, z, \dots \in V$ of a finite graph G . In its conservative version, each particle jumps from a site x to another one y at rate $c_{xy}(\alpha_y + \eta_y)$, where:

- $c_{xy} = c_{yx} \geq 0$ is a symmetric weight attached to the edge xy ;
- $\alpha_y > 0$ is a weight attached to the arrival site y ;
- $\eta_y \in \mathbb{N}_0$ denotes the number of particles sitting on y .

While the rate $c_{xy} \alpha_y$ accounts for the free motion (or diffusion) of each particle, $c_{xy} \eta_y$ introduces an interaction among them by favoring jumps on top of already occupied sites. Moreover, this dynamics is conservative (i.e., it preserves the total number of particles), reversible with respect to a discrete Dirichlet distribution, and irreducible as soon as the underlying graph is connected. We refer to Section 2 below for the detailed definition of the process and its properties.

For now, let us just remark that SIP arises within different contexts (e.g., as a discrete model of heat conduction [GKR07], and as a multi-type Moran model from population genetics with non-mean-field interactions), and comes with closely related models from statistical physics. For instance, by setting $\alpha_y = 1$ and replacing the plus sign with a minus sign in the rates, one obtains the renowned symmetric exclusion process [Spi70]. Furthermore, SIP admits a continuous-spin counterpart, referred to as the Brownian energy process [GKR09] (see also Section 8.1 below). This continuous-spin model, roughly speaking, describes the energies of an instance of Kac’s walk [Kac56], in which velocities evolve as interacting diffusions, rather than being instantaneously updated at random “collision” times.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60K35; secondary 60J27, 05C50.

Key words and phrases. Spectral gap; interacting particle systems; Dirichlet distribution; symmetric inclusion process; Brownian energy process.

In all these models, a central question is that of determining precise convergence rates to equilibrium, and, in the context of reversible processes, one of the most investigated quantities for this purpose is the so-called *spectral gap*.

1.1. One-particle spectral gap identity. For SIP on a graph $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$ endowed with site weights $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$,

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) > 0$$

denotes the corresponding spectral gap, i.e., the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of (the negative of) the infinitesimal generator (see Section 2 for the precise definition). In a previous work [KS24], we established the following bounds on $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$ in terms of $\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha)$, the spectral gap of the random walk (RW) on G which jumps from x to y with rate $c_{xy} \alpha_y$: for all graphs G and site weights α ,

$$(1 \wedge \alpha_{\min}) \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha) \leq \text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) \leq \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha) . \quad (1.1)$$

Here and all throughout, $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$ and $\alpha_{\min} := \min_{x \in V} \alpha_x$.

Notably, as soon as $\alpha_{\min} \geq 1$, the inequalities in (1.1) saturate to an identity:

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha) , \quad \alpha_{\min} \geq 1 . \quad (1.2)$$

This one-particle reduction corresponds to a SIP-version of the celebrated Aldous' spectral gap conjecture, originally formulated for interchange and symmetric exclusion processes in the early 90s, and settled two decades later in [CLR10]. In fact, the identity in (1.2) is extremely powerful, as it reduces, for every underlying graph G , the spectral gap of SIP — an infinite system, as it may consist of arbitrarily many particles — to that of RW, a much simpler Markov chain with finite state space V , for which several techniques to bound the spectral gap in terms of simple features of the underlying graph G are known (see, e.g., [SC97, MT06, LP17, Her23]). For completeness, let us emphasize that an identity like (1.2), while trivial for a system of independent particles, is not at all expected to hold for truly interacting systems. Indeed, apart from the processes treated in [CLR10], only a handful of other models were discovered to satisfy, on any geometry, a spectral gap identity involving the corresponding random walk. These models are:

- the symmetric exclusion process in contact with reservoirs in [Sal23, Sal24];
- the Binomial splitting process in [QS23, BC24].

The identity in (1.2) adds SIP to the short list above, provided that $\alpha_{\min} \geq 1$ (we shall also refer to this condition as “log-concave regime”, see Remark 2.1 below).

One of our main results (**Theorem 2.4**) states that, without this condition on α_{\min} , this identity, in general, fails: for some graphs G and site weights α ,

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) \not\leq \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha) . \quad (1.3)$$

In other words, the factor $1 \wedge \alpha_{\min}$ in (1.1) cannot be generally neglected when

$$\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1) . \quad (1.4)$$

This naturally leads us to further investigate this regime, with the twofold goal of:

- (a) deriving an alternative lower bound for $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$, better capturing its dependence on α_{\min} ;
- (b) obtaining a two-particle reduction of $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$, in the asymptotic regime of vanishing diffusivity $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

We discuss these two steps in Sections 1.2 and 1.3, respectively.

1.2. Sharp dependence on α_{\min} . In order to isolate the role of α_{\min} , let us introduce new site weights $\hat{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha_{\min}}$. With this notation, a simple scaling argument implies

$$\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha) = \alpha_{\min} \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha}) .$$

Due to the particle interaction, the same argument does not directly apply to $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha)$. Instead, if combined with the inequalities in (1.1), the above identity yields

$$\alpha_{\min}^2 \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha}) \leq \text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) \leq \alpha_{\min} \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha}) , \quad \alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1) . \quad (1.5)$$

Hence, if we encode the dependence on $(G, \hat{\alpha})$ through $\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha})$, the lower bound in (1.5) above would predict $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$ to depend on the square of α_{\min} .

Our second main result (**Theorem 2.2**) proves this guess to be wrong, showing that, in general, $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$ depends linearly, rather than quadratically as in (1.5), on $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$: for all graphs G and site weights α ,

$$C \alpha_{\min} \leq \text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) , \quad \alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1) , \quad (1.6)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on G and $\hat{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha_{\min}}$. Because of the second inequality in (1.5), the order-one dependence on α_{\min} for $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$ in (1.6) is sharp. As we will see, this sharpened result crucially requires to express the dependence on G not through $\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha})$, but other features of the underlying geometry.

1.3. Two-particle spectral gap identity. All considerations made so far leave the following question unanswered: given that the spectral gap of SIP does not always coincide with that of a single particle (namely, RW), does it instead coincide with the spectral gap of the k -particle SIP, for some integer $k \geq 2$, independent of the underlying graph G and site weights α ?

Asking the same question for SIP's "instantaneously thermalized" variant also known as Beta-Binomial splitting process (see, e.g., [PR23] or Section 8.2) — Pietro Caputo conjectured (personal communication) this spectral gap reduction to hold true with $k = 2$. In words, the Beta-Binomial splitting dynamics consists of, first selecting an edge xy with rate c_{xy} (regardless of the particle configuration), and then letting particles sitting on x and y redistribute themselves according to the SIP-equilibrium, restricted to that edge. Besides being clearly related to SIP, the Beta-Binomial splitting process is the particle analogue of a model which shows up in the literature under various names, e.g., the Kipnis-Marchioro-Presutti model [KMP82], a random walk on the simplex [CLL20], or (the energies of) the renowned Kac's walk [Kac56, CCL03]. Spectral gap estimates for this model are known only on two specific geometric settings: the complete graph [CCL03, Cap08], and the segment with $\alpha_{\min} \geq 1$ [CLL20]. In both cases, a spectral gap identity with $k = 2$ is indeed verified.

The aforementioned conjecture translates to the context of SIP as follows: for all graphs G and site weights α ,

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) = \text{gap}_2(G, \alpha) , \quad (1.7)$$

where $\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha)$, $k \geq 1$, stands for the spectral gap of the k -particle SIP. Clearly, we have $\text{gap}_1(G, \alpha) = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha)$. Moreover, in view of (1.2) and $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) \leq \text{gap}_2(G, \alpha) \leq \text{gap}_1(G, \alpha)$ in (2.6), the two-particle spectral gap identity in (1.7) remains to be verified only off the log-concave regime, i.e., when (1.4) holds.

We provide a partial answer in the affirmative to this conjecture, by determining spectral gap asymptotics as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. The precise form of the asymptotic validity of (1.7) is the content of **Theorem 2.3** below. We refer to Section 2.3 for more details, but let us briefly remark that our asymptotic analysis highlights the key role that the two-particle dynamics plays for both results in Theorems 2.3 and 2.4. We believe this point of view to be fruitful

also for other related interacting systems with Gamma-like reversible measures. For more details, see Section 8.2.

1.4. Non-conservative case. So far, we discussed only closed (or conservative) systems in which inclusion particles neither get created nor annihilated. Open (or non-conservative) systems allow for this possibility, usually modeled as systems in contact with reservoirs, see, e.g., [Spo83, DEHP93, CGGR13]. For SIP, the standard choice consists of creating a particle in x with rate $\omega_x \theta_x (\alpha_x + \eta_x)$, and annihilating each particle therein (if any) with rate $\omega_x (1 + \theta_x)$, where ω_x and θ_x form a set of non-negative site parameters added to the model. For precise definitions, see Section 6.

In essence, the open SIP presents two main features: first, due to the lack of particle conservation, the configuration space now consists of a unique, countably infinite, irreducible component; second, the unique ergodic measure is reversible if the θ -parameters do not depend on x , and non-reversible if they do depend. This drastic change from reversibility to non-reversibility goes together with the emergence of a number of remarkable phenomena (e.g., currents, long-range correlations), which distinguish equilibrium from non-equilibrium statistical mechanics, see, e.g., [Spo91, DMP91, KL99, Sch01].

Nevertheless, as already observed in the physics literature around thirty years ago for a large class of exactly solvable models [ADHR94] (see also [FGK20]), the “spectrum” does not depend on the θ -parameters, and, thus, is the same for both equilibrium and non-equilibrium systems. The quotation marks above are required when dealing with infinite configuration spaces and corresponding generators, because the full spectrum, *a priori*, may include also non-eigenvalues and may depend on the underlying functional space on which the matrix/operators act. That said, this θ -independence of the spectrum becomes rigorous for systems having a finite configuration space as, for instance, the symmetric exclusion process in contact with reservoirs (see Remark 6.6 below for more details).

In this article, we establish the following results for the non-conservative SIP, for any underlying graph G and site weights α , ω , and θ :

- (i) Eigenfunctions of the purely absorbing system (corresponding to $\theta \equiv 0$) “lift” to (generalized) eigenfunctions of SIP corresponding to the same eigenvalues.
- (ii) Remarkably, the spectral gap of the particle system with $\theta \equiv 0$ coincides with

$$\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha, \omega) > 0 ,$$

the spectral gap of the one-particle system, namely, of the random walk evolving on G , and killed with rate ω_x when sitting on $x \in V$ (**Theorem 6.1**).

- (iii) In the reversible case (i.e., when $\theta \equiv \text{const.}$), the eigenfunctions obtained in (i) provide an orthonormal basis in a natural L^2 -space.

Let us emphasize that step (i) holds in both reversible and non-reversible settings, while step (ii) is a statement concerning the case $\theta \equiv 0$ only; establishing the claim in (iii) is where we need to restrict to the reversible SIP.

Putting these steps together, our main result in this non-conservative setting (**Corollary 6.4**) may be summarized as follows: for all graphs G and site weights α and ω ,

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha, \omega, \varrho) = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha, \omega) , \quad \text{whenever } \theta \equiv \varrho > 0 ,$$

where $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha, \omega, \varrho)$ denotes the first gap in the spectrum of the reversible SIP with $\theta \equiv \varrho > 0$, compatibly with the functional setting of step (iii).

When comparing the conservative and non-conservative settings, we remark a striking different behavior of SIP’s spectral gap: while a system of *two particles* sharply captures the spectral gap of the many-particle *closed* SIP, the spectral gap of the *open* SIP is always governed (at least when $\theta \equiv \text{const.}$) by that of a *single random walk with killing* — with

no constraint on the value of $\alpha_{\min} > 0$. We believe this dichotomy to hold true not just for SIP, but also for a larger class of interacting systems in statistical mechanics having Dirichlet-like steady states.

1.5. Organization of the paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Sections 2–5 concern the closed SIP. More specifically, Section 2 contains the model definition, the main results (Theorems 2.2–2.4), and an outline of their proofs. In Sections 3–4, we present the proof of Theorem 2.2; in Section 5, we prove the remaining two theorems from Section 2. Sections 6–7 focus on SIP in contact with reservoirs, the first one of these sections detailing the model and main results, the second one presenting the proofs of the main results therein. Finally, in Section 8, we briefly discuss some extensions of our results to discrete and continuous-spin models related to SIP. In particular, in view of the isospectrality showed in [KS24] between SIP and Brownian energy process, we derive spectral gap estimates for the latter. We conclude the paper with two appendices, in which we provide the full proofs of two technical ingredients employed in Section 5.

2. CONSERVATIVE SIP. SETTING AND MAIN RESULTS

Unless stated otherwise, all throughout the article, our underlying geometry consists of a weighted finite graph $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$, with symmetric conductances $c_{xy} = c_{yx} \geq 0$ (conventionally, $c_{xx} = 0$). We always assume the undirected graph G to be connected, i.e., for all $x, y \in V$, there exists a sequence $x_0 = x, x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, x_\ell = y$ in V such that $\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} c_{x_{j-1}x_j} > 0$. The length $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ of the shortest sequence connecting two distinct sites $x, y \in V$ corresponds to their graph distance, $\text{dist}_G(x, y)$. As usual, we define the diameter, $\text{diam}(G) \in \{1, \dots, |V|\}$, as the largest of all pairwise distances.

2.1. Model. For a graph $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$, some positive site weights $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$ denotes the Markov chain evolving on the configuration space

$$\Xi_k := \left\{ \eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^V : |\eta| = k \right\}, \quad \text{with } |\eta| := \sum_{x \in V} \eta_x,$$

with infinitesimal generator given, for all $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$, as

$$L_{G,\alpha,k} f(\eta) = \sum_{x,y \in V} c_{xy} \eta_x (\alpha_y + \eta_y) (f(\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y) - f(\eta)), \quad \eta \in \Xi_k. \quad (2.1)$$

In this formula, $\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y \in \Xi_k$ denotes the configuration obtained from η by removing a particle from x (if any) and placing it on y . Since all particle configurations in Ξ_k are accessible, $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$ is irreducible. As a simple detailed balance computation shows, $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$ admits a unique reversible measure $\mu_{\alpha,k}$, given, for all $\eta \in \Xi_k$, by

$$\mu_{\alpha,k}(\eta) = \frac{1}{Z_{\alpha,k}} \prod_{x \in V} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_x + \eta_x)}{\Gamma(\alpha_x) \eta_x!}, \quad \text{with } Z_{\alpha,k} := \frac{\Gamma(|\alpha| + k)}{\Gamma(|\alpha|) k!}. \quad (2.2)$$

Here, Γ denotes the usual gamma function satisfying, for all $a > 0$, $\Gamma(a + 1) = a \Gamma(a)$.

Remark 2.1 (Log-concavity). The measure $\mu_{\alpha,k}$ in (2.2) is known as Dirichlet-Multinomial distribution of parameters $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$, and is the discrete analogue of the Dirichlet distribution on the simplex $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^V$ of probability measures, see (8.1) and (8.2) below. The Dirichlet distribution is well known to be log-concave (in the sense that its probability density is of the form $\exp(-U)$, for some convex $U : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) if and only if $\alpha_{\min} \geq 1$. Hence, $\mu_{\alpha,k}$ is the discrete counterpart of a log-concave measure if and only if $\alpha_{\min} \geq 1$. More directly, $\mu_{\alpha,k}$ is a “discrete log-concave measure” also in the following sense: $\mu_{\alpha,k}$ is the canonical measure (i.e., conditional on $|\eta| = k$) of the product measure

$\nu_{\alpha,\varrho}$ in (6.2) below, whose Negative-Binomial marginal measures on \mathbb{N}_0 are log-concave (i.e., $\nu_{\alpha,\varrho}(\eta_x = \ell)^2 \geq \nu_{\alpha,\varrho}(\eta_x = \ell - 1)\nu_{\alpha,\varrho}(\eta_x = \ell + 1)$, for all $\ell \geq 1$ and $x \in V$) if and only if $\alpha_{\min} \geq 1$.

2.2. A non-asymptotic lower bound for the spectral gap. Because of irreducibility and reversibility, all $|\Xi_k|$ eigenvalues of the (negative) generator $-L_{G,\alpha,k}$ in (2.1) are real and non-negative, the smallest one being equal to zero, whereas the second one — referred to as spectral gap of $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$ and shortened as $\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha)$ — being strictly positive. Confronting with the notation from Section 1, we have

$$\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha) = \text{gap}_1(G, \alpha) , \quad (2.3)$$

because $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$ with $k = 1$ corresponds to a single, thus, non-interacting particle, abbreviated as $\text{RW}(G, \alpha)$. All cases $k \geq 2$ describe a truly interacting system; hence, we define

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) = \inf_{k \geq 2} \text{gap}_k(G, \alpha) . \quad (2.4)$$

We are now ready to state the precise statement of the result in (1.6), concerned with the sharp dependence of $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$ on $\alpha_{\min} = \min_{x \in V} \alpha_x$, with a special focus on the regime $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$.

Theorem 2.2. *For all graphs $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$ and site weights $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$, we have*

$$\alpha_{\min} \left\{ \frac{1}{21} \frac{\alpha_{\text{ratio}}}{6^{\alpha_{\min}/\alpha_{\text{ratio}}}} \frac{c_{\min}}{|V|^2 \text{diam}(G)} \right\} \leq \text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha) ,$$

where

$$\alpha_{\text{ratio}} := \frac{\alpha_{\min}}{\alpha_{\max}} = \frac{\min_{x \in V} \alpha_x}{\max_{y \in V} \alpha_y} \leq 1 , \quad c_{\min} := \min_{\substack{x,y \in V \\ c_{xy} > 0}} c_{xy} > 0 . \quad (2.5)$$

As already discussed in Section 1.2, this lower bound captures the correct dependence of $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$ on α_{\min} for every fixed G , provided that α_{ratio} remains bounded away from zero. Moreover, the estimate is non-asymptotic, with a rather explicit constant depending on some relevant features of the graph, such as its size and diameter. Nevertheless, we do not claim this factor to be sharp, and certainly there is plenty of room for improving our proof arguments when passing to concrete examples such as d -dimensional discrete boxes and tori, complete bipartite graphs, trees, etc.

Instead of pursuing this plan, we stick to general geometries, but pass to the regime of vanishing weights $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. In this setting, we provide an asymptotic characterization of this factor not in terms of the spectral gap of $\text{RW}(G, \alpha)$, but of the “second simplest system” on this geometry: $\text{SIP}_2(G, \alpha)$, namely, the symmetric inclusion process with just two particles.

2.3. Spectral gap’s asymptotics. As already proved in [KS24] (see also Section 3.1 below), we have, for all graphs G and site weights α ,

$$\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha) \leq \text{gap}_{k-1}(G, \alpha) , \quad k \geq 2 . \quad (2.6)$$

The next result shows that, in the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, we can reverse the above inequality for $k \geq 3$. In what follows, for simplicity, instead of $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V} \rightarrow 0$, we consider

$$\alpha = \varepsilon \hat{\alpha} , \quad \text{with } 0 < \varepsilon \ll 1 \text{ and } \hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_x)_{x \in V} \text{ fixed} . \quad (2.7)$$

Theorem 2.3. *For all graphs $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$ and site weights $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_x)_{x \in V}$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{gap}_k(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})}{\text{gap}_2(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})} = 1 , \quad k \geq 3 .$$

In view of the definition of $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$ in (2.4) and of the inequalities in (2.6), the above limit is an asymptotic version of the two-particle spectral gap identity in (1.7). Let us stress that this result holds true for any graph G and integer $k \geq 3$. However, the case $k = 2$ is excluded for a good reason, as shown in the following result.

Theorem 2.4. *For some graphs $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$ and site weights $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_x)_{x \in V}$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{gap}_2(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})}{\text{gap}_1(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})} < 1. \quad (2.8)$$

This inequality provides, if combined with (2.6) and the definitions in (2.3)–(2.4), an instance of (1.3), namely, of the failure of the one-particle spectral gap identity in (1.2). The graphs G and site weights $\hat{\alpha}$ which we adopt to prove this result are far from being intricate. In fact, we decide to take G to be the most standard d -dimensional discrete torus, with $d \geq 2$ and sufficiently large size, and $\hat{\alpha} \equiv 1$. These are just some of the possible examples that one could exhibit for proving (2.8). Indeed, as it will become apparent from the proof, essentially any other sparse geometry for which the random walk’s relaxation time (i.e., $\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha)^{-1}$) is much smaller than the expected meeting time of two independent random walks initialized at equilibrium, will equally work. We refer to the subsequent section for further explanations.

2.4. Proofs outline. Recall that an inclusion particle jumps from x to a nearest neighbor y at rate proportional to $\alpha_y + \eta_y$. On the one hand, when non-zero, the term $\eta_y \geq 1$ stands for the interaction between particles on adjacent sites, which mutually attract each other, tending to stick together. On the other hand, $\alpha_y > 0$ represents an independent mechanism of particle diffusion. In this sense, the regime $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$ depicts the situation in which, at least in some portions of the graph, particle stickiness dominates over diffusion.

This regime becomes particularly significant when considering the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. In this setting, SIP(G, α) exhibits a metastable behavior, as thoroughly studied in the last decade [GRV13, BDG17, KS21, Kim21, Kim23]. These works describe the following qualitative picture, when $\alpha = \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}$ as in (2.7). Roughly speaking, as long as particles are far from each other (i.e., at graph distance ≥ 2), they perform jumps on the timescale ε^{-1} . As soon as they are at distance one, they stick together in a much shorter time, roughly of order one. These two mechanisms bring particles to meet and pile up together in large stacks (or, condensates) in a time of order ε^{-1} . Concurrently, some particles sitting on a stack would still attempt to jump to empty nearest neighboring vertices at rate $\asymp \varepsilon$. While some of the attempts fail, that is, the “courageous” particle is instantaneously sucked back into a neighboring stack, some of these will succeed to attract sufficiently many particles, managing to move the whole stack. Due to the rates’ symmetry encoded in the condition $c_{xy} = c_{yx}$, it is then part of the results in [GRV13, BDG17] to show that relevant jumps of entire stacks occur at times of order ε^{-1} , and that, on this timescale, stacks are effectively approximated by independent random walks on G , each evolving at rate proportional to ε , and capable of coalescing (possibly in a very complicated way if three or more stacks are involved) when getting at distance one from each other. Hence, the metastable relevant part of the dynamics takes place, according to this qualitative picture, on the timescale ε^{-1} .

Although this metastable picture provides a first correct intuition that $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}) \asymp \varepsilon$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, our quantitative analysis must take into account also features not captured by usual metastability limit theorems. For instance, while metastability describes macroscopic features of the system when initialized from macroscopically relevant configurations, global functional inequalities as those determining spectral gaps require bounds which must be uniform over the initial conditions. Moreover, we seek for lower bounds for $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$ being independent of the system size. However, a crucial ingredient in the metastability

picture of $\text{SIP}(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$ is that $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the number of particles in the system is not too large; more precisely,

$$\log k \ll \varepsilon^{-1}, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \ll 1. \quad (2.9)$$

This condition, always assumed in previous works (see, e.g., [GRV13, BDG17, Kim21, Kim23]) is not just technical, but strictly required for the condensation mechanism to take place: (2.9) is a sufficient and necessary condition for the steady state of the system to charge configurations consisting of a single stack of particles only.

2.4.1. *Outline of the proof of Theorem 2.2.* Our proof for determining the order-one dependence on $\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}_{\min}$ of $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$ combines three main ingredients:

- the nested eigenstructure of SIP (valid for any underlying graph G) as already exploited in [KS24];
- the full knowledge of the eigendecomposition in mean-field geometries and, more specifically, the fact that eigenvalues grow quadratically (neglecting multiplicities) with the particle total number;
- comparison inequalities of Dirichlet forms associated to the particle system on a graph G , against that on the complete graph.

All three steps are presented and combined to yield the proof of Theorem 2.2 in Section 3, but the actual proof of the comparison inequality, longer and more technical, is presented in Section 4.

In the metastable regime (2.9), our comparisons build on the classical distinguishing paths method as applied, e.g., in the seminal work [DSC93] to the symmetric exclusion process. Most of the care in our context lies in devising paths in which the total “cost” becomes not larger than $\varepsilon^{-1} k^2$, up to constants depending only on G and $\hat{\alpha}$. Here, the cost of each move heavily depends on whether relocating a single particle augments, keeps constant, or lowers the total number of stacks, and whether stacks do have or not neighboring stacks. Hence, following the metastable behavior of the system offers us a guideline to construct efficient distinguishing paths, e.g., taking care of never creating more than one extra occupied site along the path. We refer to Sections 4.2 and 4.3 for the details.

When (2.9) does not hold, as already mentioned, the metastability picture breaks down, and so does this approach via distinguishing paths. In order to overcome this, we replace paths by more sophisticated two-dimensional ones, as particular instances of flows. In presence of stacks consisting of a huge number of particles, these two-dimensional paths allow us to rigorously implement the idea of moving only a smaller portion of the stack at the time according to some suitably chosen probability, and leaving the rest untouched. While this strategy of moving only some (and not all) particles of a stack produces an extra factor ε^{-1} , which we could not afford in the regime (2.9), this is now not problematic, as we can control this factor with a suitable function of the number of particles of the stack. For more details, see Section 4.4.

As we just sketched, these estimates involving Dirichlet forms yield comparison constants which unavoidably degenerate like $1/k^2$ as the total number of particles $k \in \mathbb{N}$ grows. Here is where we crucially exploit the first two ingredients of the proof, in particular, the quadratic growth of eigenvalues for the mean-field system, which removes this degeneracy.

2.4.2. *Outline of the proof of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4.* In order to establish the strict inequality between $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$ and $\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$ as in (1.3), comparison arguments as those we just described turn out to be too loose (and, actually, too elaborated) to capture the precise pre-factors. Instead, we follow a more basic approach, namely, turning the aforementioned metastability picture into some quantitative spectral information.

More specifically, for a fixed graph G and a fixed number of particles $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we employ and sharpen classical limit theorems for slow-fast systems from [Kur73] (see also [GRV13] for another application in the context of SIP). These theorems rigorously describe the metastable dynamics for the slow macroscopic variables of $\text{SIP}(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$ in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The limit of the slow variables after a thermalization of the fast ones identifies the low-lying spectrum. This allows us to capture the behavior of $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$, at least for ε small enough. These intuitive ideas are stated and proved rigorously in Section 5.1.

We are then left with identifying the spectral gap of the limiting metastable dynamics. In contrast to SIP, which is irreducible, this metastable chain may consist of both recurrent and transient states, as we detail in Section 5.2. Recurrent regions correspond to those configurations in which all particles sit together, and the resulting single stack moves like $\text{RW}(G, \hat{\alpha})$. Transient states are those configurations in which there are stacks at graph distance at least two from each other. Hence, the spectral gap of the metastable process is just the smallest among the random walk's gap and the eigenvalues associated to any part of the (sub-stochastic) transient dynamics.

Most of our work is devoted to analyzing the hierarchy of transient states. Indeed, even the decomposition into irreducible components and the jump rates of the transient dynamics are, in general, highly complicated and non-trivially dependent on the underlying geometry and the number of particles. Nevertheless, by exploiting a form of consistency for the metastable limiting dynamics, we are able to deduce that the lowest-lying eigenvalue of the transient dynamics is attained by the system with just *two* particles, as adding more particles — thus, potentially, stacks — does not cause any slowdown in the system. More in detail, in Section 5.3, we verify that one only needs to focus on the number of stacks (and not on the precise allocation of particles in each stack): for each $m \geq 2$, the smallest eigenvalue of all transient sub-systems with m piles comes exactly from the sub-system with m isolated particles. As a next step, in Section 5.4, we prove that the smallest eigenvalue of all sub-systems with $m \geq 2$ isolated particles is attained at $m = 2$, i.e., the sub-system with two isolated particles. Collecting these observations, we prove Theorem 2.3 in Section 5.5. Theorem 2.4 is also proved in this section: by exploiting this rigorous metastable description of eigenvalues' asymptotics, our proof boils down to estimates of relaxation and mean meeting times of independent particles on a well studied geometry, corresponding, respectively, to (the inverse of) the spectral gap of the recurrent and transient dynamics of SIP's metastable process.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

We follow the outline in Section 2.4.1.

3.1. General eigenstructure of SIP. We start by recalling from [KS24] some general facts on the eigenstructure of SIP functional to our analysis. First of all, SIP is consistent, in the sense that the system with $k - 1$ particles is recovered (in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions) from the system with k particles, provided that one particle is removed *uniformly at random*. In formula, this means that

$$L_{G, \alpha, k} \mathbf{a}_k = \mathbf{a}_k L_{G, \alpha, k-1} \quad (3.1)$$

holds true for all graphs G , site weights α , and $k \geq 2$, where $\mathbf{a}_k : \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ is the *annihilation operator* defined as

$$\mathbf{a}_k g(\eta) := \sum_{x \in V} \eta_x g(\eta - \delta_x), \quad g \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_{k-1}}, \quad \eta \in \Xi_k. \quad (3.2)$$

As proved in [KS24, Appendix A], \mathbf{a}_k is one-to-one. This readily implies that the (real) spectrum of $L_{G,\alpha,k-1}$ is contained (with multiplicities) in that of $L_{G,\alpha,k}$ (and, in particular, that (2.6) holds). More precisely, if (λ, f) is an eigenvalue-eigenfunction pair for $-L_{G,\alpha,k-1}$, then $(\lambda, \mathbf{a}_k f)$ is one for $-L_{G,\alpha,k}$. As a consequence of this fact and reversibility, the rest of the spectrum of $-L_{G,\alpha,k}$ that does not come from $-L_{G,\alpha,k-1}$ must be found in the orthogonal complement of those eigenfunctions “lifted” from those of $-L_{G,\alpha,k-1}$. This observation leads us to introduce the *creation operator* $\mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger : \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_{k-1}}$:

$$\mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger f(\xi) := \sum_{x \in V} (\xi_x + \alpha_x) f(\xi + \delta_x), \quad f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}, \quad \xi \in \Xi_{k-1}.$$

As demonstrated in [KS24, Proposition 3.1], the two operators \mathbf{a}_k and $\mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger$ are adjoint one to each other in the following sense:

$$\langle \mathbf{a}_k g | f \rangle_{\alpha,k} = \frac{k}{|\alpha| + k - 1} \langle g | \mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger f \rangle_{\alpha,k-1}, \quad f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}, \quad g \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_{k-1}},$$

where $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\alpha,k}$ denotes the inner product in Ξ_k with respect to $\mu_{\alpha,k}$ given in (2.2). In turn, $\mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger$ is onto and the following orthogonal decomposition holds:

$$L^2(\mu_{\alpha,k}) = \text{Im } \mathbf{a}_k \oplus_\perp \text{Ker } \mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger. \quad (3.3)$$

Next, let us recall a well-known variational characterization of $\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha)$: for each $k \geq 2$,

$$\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha) = \inf_{\substack{f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k} \\ f \neq \text{const.}}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{G,\alpha,k}(f)}{\text{Var}_{\alpha,k}(f)}. \quad (3.4)$$

Here, $\mathcal{E}_{G,\alpha,k}(f) = \langle f | -L_{G,\alpha,k} f \rangle_{\alpha,k}$ denotes the Dirichlet form evaluated at $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$, namely,

$$\mathcal{E}_{G,\alpha,k}(f) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \sum_{x,y \in V} \mu_{\alpha,k}(\eta) c_{xy} \eta_x (\alpha_y + \eta_y) (f(\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y) - f(\eta))^2,$$

whereas $\text{Var}_{\alpha,k}(f)$ stands for the variance of $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ with respect to $\mu_{\alpha,k}$. It is immediate to check that, if $f \in \text{Ker } \mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger$, then $\langle f \rangle_{\alpha,k} = \langle f | 1 \rangle_{\alpha,k} = 0$ and, thus,

$$\text{Var}_{\alpha,k}(f) = \|f\|_{\alpha,k}^2 := \sum_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha,k}(\eta) f(\eta)^2.$$

Taking advantage of the lifting property of \mathbf{a}_k , the self-adjointness of $L_{G,\alpha,k}$ on $L^2(\mu_{\alpha,k})$, and the orthogonal decomposition in (3.3), (3.4) simplifies as follows:

$$\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha) = \text{gap}_{k-1}(G, \alpha) \wedge \left(\inf_{\substack{f \in \text{Ker } \mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger \\ f \neq 0}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{G,\alpha,k}(f)}{\|f\|_{\alpha,k}^2} \right). \quad (3.5)$$

Hence, by an iterative argument on $k \geq 2$, we may focus on comparing $\mathcal{E}_{G,\alpha,k}(f)$ and $\|f\|_{\alpha,k}^2$, only for functions $f \in \text{Ker } \mathbf{a}_{\alpha,k-1}^\dagger$.

3.2. Dirichlet forms and comparisons. The Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}_{G,\alpha,k}(f)$ depends on the underlying graph structure, whereas the orthogonal decomposition in (3.3) and $\|f\|_{\alpha,k}^2$ do not. This simple observation motivates us to compare $\mathcal{E}_{G,\alpha,k}(f)$ with its complete graph analogue, i.e., $\mathcal{E}_{K,\alpha,k}(f)$, where $K = K_V$ denotes the complete graph on the sites of V with unitary conductances $c_{xy} \equiv 1$.

It turns out that, in this complete graph case, we can obtain the full eigendecomposition of SIP. Remark that, although the spectrum and a set of eigenfunctions of $\text{SIP}_k(K, \alpha)$ are

known [Shi77] (see also [Cor23, Theorem 1.4] or [WZ19] and references therein), the next proposition, together with the identity in (3.5), provides a simple and complete description of eigenvalues and eigenspaces when $G = K$, which we shall exploit later.

Proposition 3.1. *For every $k \geq 1$ and $f \in \text{Ker } \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, k-1}^\dagger$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_{K, \alpha, k}(f) = k (|\alpha| + k - 1) \|f\|_{\alpha, k}^2. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. The result is well known for $k = 1$, the random walk case. Indeed, $\text{Ker } \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, 0}^\dagger$ coincides with the subspace of functions $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_1}$ having mean zero with respect to $\mu_{\alpha, 1}$, which equals $\mu_{\alpha, 1}(\delta_x) = \frac{\alpha_x}{|\alpha|}$, $x \in V$.

Now, fix $k \geq 2$ and $f \in \text{Ker } \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, k-1}^\dagger$. By [KS24, Eq. (3.10)], we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{K, \alpha, k}(f) = k \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha, k-1}(\xi) \mathcal{E}_{K, \alpha + \xi, 1}(f_\xi), \quad (3.7)$$

with $f_\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_1}$ being defined as $f_\xi(\delta_x) := f(\xi + \delta_x)$. Remark that one easily deduces (3.7) from the following identity ([KS24, Eq. (3.9)]): for all $x \in V$ and $\xi \in \Xi_{k-1}$,

$$\mu_{\alpha, k}(\xi + \delta_x) (\xi_x + 1) = \frac{Z_{\alpha, k-1}}{Z_{\alpha, k}} \mu_{\alpha, k-1}(\xi) (\alpha_x + \xi_x) = k \mu_{\alpha, k-1}(\xi) \frac{\alpha_x + \xi_x}{|\alpha| + k - 1}, \quad (3.8)$$

where the second step used (cf. (2.2))

$$\frac{Z_{\alpha, k-1}}{Z_{\alpha, k}} = \frac{k}{|\alpha| + k - 1}.$$

Analogously, we get

$$\|f\|_{\alpha, k}^2 = \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_{k-1}} \mu_{\alpha, k-1}(\xi) \|f_\xi\|_{\alpha + \xi, 1}^2. \quad (3.9)$$

By (3.7), the identity in (3.6) for $k = 1$ (note that $f \in \text{Ker } \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, k-1}^\dagger$ ensures that $f_\xi \in \text{Ker } \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, 0}^\dagger$) and $|\xi| = k - 1$, and (3.9), we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_{K, \alpha, k}(f) = k (|\alpha| + k - 1) \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_{k-1}} \mu_{\alpha, k-1}(\xi) \|f_\xi\|_{\alpha + \xi, 1}^2 = k (|\alpha| + k - 1) \|f\|_{\alpha, k}^2,$$

namely, the desired result. \square

In view of (3.5) and Proposition 3.1, it remains to compare the two Dirichlet forms $\mathcal{E}_{G, \alpha, k}(f)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{K, \alpha, k}(f)$, for any $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$. This is the content of the following theorem, and certainly represents the hardest step of the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Theorem 3.2. *For all $k \geq 2$ and $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_{K, \alpha, k}(f) \leq \frac{21 k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) |V|^2 \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}} \mathcal{E}_{G, \alpha, k}(f). \quad (3.10)$$

We postpone the proof of this estimate to Section 4 and, in Remark 4.5, we discuss possible improvements.

Remark 3.3. While all previous steps relied on the fact that we chose the test function f in $\text{Ker } \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, k-1}^\dagger$, in this last theorem we do not exploit any specifics of $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$.

3.3. Proof of Theorem 2.2. Assuming the validity of Theorem 3.2, we now conclude the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. By (2.4), (3.5) and an iterative argument, it suffices to prove

$$\inf_{\substack{f \in \text{Ker } \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, k-1}^\dagger \\ f \neq 0}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{G, \alpha, k}(f)}{\|f\|_{\alpha, k}^2} \geq \alpha_{\min} \frac{1}{21} \frac{\alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}}{6^{\alpha_{\max}} |V|^2 \text{diam}(G)}, \quad k \geq 2.$$

By Theorem 3.2 and Proposition 3.1, we have, for all $f \in \text{Ker } \mathfrak{a}_{\alpha, k-1}^\dagger$ and $k \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{G, \alpha, k}(f) &\geq \frac{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}}{21 k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) |V|^2 \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}} \mathcal{E}_{K, \alpha, k}(f) \\ &= \frac{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} (|\alpha| + k - 1)}{21 (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) |V|^2 \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}} \|f\|_{\alpha, k}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{21} \frac{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}}{|V|^2 \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}} \|f\|_{\alpha, k}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2

Since G, α, k and $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ are fixed all throughout this section, we abbreviate

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{G, \alpha, k}(f) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_K = \mathcal{E}_{K, \alpha, k}(f). \quad (4.1)$$

Let us assume that an ordering is given on V , so that

$$\mathcal{E}_K = \sum_{x < y} \sum_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha, k}(\eta) \eta_x (\alpha_y + \eta_y) (f(\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y) - f(\eta))^2 =: \sum_{x < y} \mathcal{E}_K^{x, y}, \quad (4.2)$$

where, for any pair $x < y$, $\mathcal{E}_K^{x, y}$ is defined as the summation in $\eta \in \Xi_k$ above. Since there are $\binom{|V|}{2}$ of such pairs, the claim in (3.10) boils down to prove that, for every $x < y$,

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{x, y} \leq \frac{42 k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}} \mathcal{E}. \quad (4.3)$$

In the remainder of this section, we fix $x < y$ and prove (4.3).

For $A \subseteq V$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$, define

$$\Xi_\ell^A := \left\{ \sigma \in \Xi_\ell : \sum_{x \in A} \sigma_x = \ell \right\}.$$

Note that $\Xi_k^V = \Xi_k$. Moreover, for $\sigma \in \Xi_\ell^A$, $y_1, \dots, y_s \in V$, and $m_1, \dots, m_s \in \mathbb{N}_0$, define

$$\sigma_{m_1, \dots, m_s}^{y_1, \dots, y_s} := \sigma + \sum_{i=1}^s m_i \delta_{y_i} \in \Xi_{\ell + m_1 + \dots + m_s}, \quad (4.4)$$

where the right-hand side should be understood as a summation of functions. Thus, the number of particles in the new configuration $\sigma_{m_1, \dots, m_s}^{y_1, \dots, y_s}$ equals $\ell + m_1 + \dots + m_s$.

According to (4.4), we may decompose the Dirichlet summation $\mathcal{E}_K^{x, y}$ in (4.2) as

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \sum_{\sigma \in \Xi_{k-\ell}^{V \setminus \{x, y\}}} \mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m) (f(\sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}) - f(\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}))^2,$$

where $\ell \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket := [1, k] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ denotes the number of particles in $\{x, y\}$, and $m \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket$ denotes the number of particles at x . For each $\ell \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$, $m \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket$, and $\sigma \in \Xi_{k-\ell}^{V \setminus \{x, y\}}$, define $\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} = \mathcal{E}_K^{x, y, \ell, m, \sigma}$ as

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} := \mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m) (f(\sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}) - f(\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}))^2, \quad (4.5)$$

so that

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{x, y} = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \sum_{\sigma \in \Xi_{k-\ell}^{V \setminus \{x, y\}}} \mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma}. \quad (4.6)$$

Fix a shortest sequence

$$x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t = y \quad (4.7)$$

in G such that $c_{x_{s-1}x_s} > 0$ for all $s \in \llbracket 1, t \rrbracket$, where $t \in \llbracket 1, \text{diam}(G) \rrbracket$. For $\eta, \zeta \in \Xi_k$, write

$$\mathfrak{c}(\eta, \zeta) := \mu_{\alpha, k}(\eta) r_{\alpha, k}(\eta, \zeta) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^2 f(\eta, \zeta) := \mathfrak{c}(\eta, \zeta) (f(\zeta) - f(\eta))^2, \quad (4.8)$$

where $r_{\alpha, k}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the transition rate function of $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$. Then, we have

$$\mathcal{E} = \sum_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \sum_{\substack{z < w \\ c_{zw} > 0}} \nabla^2 f(\eta, \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w). \quad (4.9)$$

A sequence of configurations $\eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_M$ in Ξ_k is a path if the transition rates $r_{\alpha, k}(\cdot, \cdot)$ are positive along the sequence, i.e., $r_{\alpha, k}(\eta_{s-1}, \eta_s) > 0$ for all $s \in \llbracket 1, M \rrbracket$.

The idea to prove (4.3) is as follows. First, we decompose $\mathcal{E}_K^{x, y}$ according to (4.6). Then, for each triple (ℓ, m, σ) , we upper bound $\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma}$ with a certain collection of terms $\nabla^2 f(\eta, \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w)$ that appear in the right-hand side of (4.9). Finally, we count the number of overlaps for each term $\nabla^2 f(\eta, \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w)$ for all such triple (ℓ, m, σ) , which gives an upper bound of $\mathcal{E}_K^{x, y}$ in terms of \mathcal{E} .

The procedure of upper bounding each $\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma}$ depends on the detailed distribution of particles along the sequence (4.7). In the following four subsections, Sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, we demonstrate each simple cases, and finally in Section 4.5 we deal with the general case and conclude the proof of (4.3).

4.1. Connected case. First, suppose that (cf. (4.7))

$$c_{xy} > 0, \quad \text{such that } t = 1. \quad (4.10)$$

Then, it is clear that $\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}, \sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}$ is itself a path, and

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} = \frac{1}{c_{xy}} \nabla^2 f(\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}, \sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}).$$

For notational reasons, define

$$\Omega = \Omega^{x, y, \ell, m, \sigma} := \{\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}, \sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}\}.$$

Then, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that (4.10) holds. Then, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} = \frac{1}{c_{xy}} \sum_{\{\zeta, \zeta'\} \subseteq \Omega} \nabla^2 f(\zeta, \zeta').$$




FIGURE 4.1. Path of configurations from $\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}$ in Section 4.2. In this occupied case, the red particle simply moves from x to y along the sequence $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t = y$ consecutively.

4.2. **Decomposition of gradients: occupied sites.** Now, assume that (cf. (4.10))

$$c_{xy} = 0, \quad \text{such that } t \geq 2. \quad (4.11)$$

Additionally, in this subsection, assume that all sites along the sequence (4.7) are occupied by particles of σ , i.e.,

$$\sigma_{x_s} \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } s \in \llbracket 1, t-1 \rrbracket. \quad (4.12)$$

Then, starting from $\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}$, we send a single particle from x_{s-1} to x_s for each $s \in \llbracket 1, t \rrbracket$, to arrive at $\sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}$. The corresponding path becomes

$$\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}, \sigma_{m-1, 1, \ell-m}^{xx_1y}, \dots, \sigma_{m-1, 1, \ell-m}^{xx_{t-1}y}, \sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}. \quad (4.13)$$

See Figure 4.1 for a visual representation.

By Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, for any path $\eta = \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_M = \zeta$, we have (cf. (4.8))

$$(f(\zeta) - f(\eta))^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^M \nabla^2 f(\eta_{i-1}, \eta_i) \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^M \frac{1}{c(\eta_{i-1}, \eta_i)} \right). \quad (4.14)$$

Thus, applying (4.14) along the path (4.13), we get (cf. (4.5))

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} \leq \left(\sum_{s=1}^t \nabla^2 f(\sigma_{m-1, 1, \ell-m}^{xx_{s-1}y}, \sigma_{m-1, 1, \ell-m}^{xx_s y}) \right) \left(\sum_{s=1}^t \frac{\mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{c(\sigma_{m-1, 1, \ell-m}^{xx_{s-1}y}, \sigma_{m-1, 1, \ell-m}^{xx_s y})} \right). \quad (4.15)$$

For $x \in V$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, define

$$\pi_x(m) := \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_x + m)}{\Gamma(\alpha_x) m!}, \quad \text{such that } \mu_{\alpha, k}(\eta) = \frac{1}{Z_{\alpha, k}} \prod_{x \in V} \pi_x(\eta_x). \quad (4.16)$$

Since $\Gamma(a+1) = a\Gamma(a)$ for $a > 0$, we obtain

$$\alpha_x \leq \pi_x(m) (\alpha_x + m) = \pi_x(m+1) (m+1) \leq \alpha_x e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j}}. \quad (4.17)$$

Moreover, for $m \geq m' \geq 1$, we have

$$1 \leq \frac{\pi_x(m) m}{\pi_x(m') m'} \leq e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=m'}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}}. \quad (4.18)$$

By (4.16), the summation inside the second parenthesis in (4.15) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\alpha_y + \ell - m}{(\alpha_{x_1} + \sigma_{x_1}) c_{x_1}} + \frac{\pi_x(m) \pi_{x_{t-1}}(\sigma_{x_{t-1}}) m}{\pi_x(m-1) \pi_{x_{t-1}}(\sigma_{x_{t-1}} + 1) (\sigma_{x_{t-1}} + 1) c_{x_{t-1}y}} \\ & + \sum_{s=2}^{t-1} \frac{\pi_x(m) \pi_{x_{s-1}}(\sigma_{x_{s-1}}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\pi_x(m-1) \pi_{x_{s-1}}(\sigma_{x_{s-1}} + 1) (\sigma_{x_{s-1}} + 1) (\alpha_{x_s} + \sigma_{x_s}) c_{x_{s-1}x_s}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

where we divided the summation into three parts: $s = 1$, $s = t$, and $s \in \llbracket 2, t-1 \rrbracket$. The first term in (4.19) is easily bounded by (cf. (2.5))

$$\frac{\alpha_y + \ell - m}{(\alpha_{x_1} + \sigma_{x_1}) c_{x_{x_1}}} \leq \frac{\alpha_{\max} + k - 1}{c_{\min}},$$

where we used that $\sigma_{x_1} \geq 1$. By (4.16), the second term in (4.19) reads as

$$\frac{\alpha_x + m - 1}{(\alpha_{x_{t-1}} + \sigma_{x_{t-1}}) c_{x_{t-1}x_t}} \leq \frac{\alpha_{\max} + k - 1}{c_{\min}},$$

where we used that $\sigma_{x_{t-1}} \geq 1$. Finally, the third term in (4.19) is similarly dealt with:

$$\sum_{s=2}^{t-1} \frac{(\alpha_x + m - 1)(\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{(\alpha_{x_{s-1}} + \sigma_{x_{s-1}})(\alpha_{x_s} + \sigma_{x_s}) c_{x_{s-1}x_s}} \leq \frac{\text{diam}(G) (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1)^2}{c_{\min}},$$

where we used that $\sigma_{x_{s-1}} \geq 1$ and $\sigma_{x_s} \geq 1$ for all $s \in \llbracket 2, t-1 \rrbracket$. Therefore, inserting these three bounds into (4.15), we conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} \leq \frac{3 \text{diam}(G) (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1)^2}{c_{\min}} \left(\sum_{s=1}^t \nabla^2 f(\sigma_{m-1,1,\ell-m}^{xx_{s-1}y}, \sigma_{m-1,1,\ell-m}^{xx_{s-1}y}) \right).$$

Let $\Omega = \Omega^{x,y,\ell,m,\sigma}$ be the collection of those configurations that appear in the path from $\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{xy}$. With this notation, we summarize as in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that the condition in (4.12) holds. Then, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} \leq \frac{3 \text{diam}(G) (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1)^2}{c_{\min}} \sum_{\{\zeta, \zeta'\} \subseteq \Omega} \nabla^2 f(\zeta, \zeta').$$

4.3. Decomposition of gradients: empty sites & few particles. Next, assume (4.11) and that sites x_1, \dots, x_{t-1} are empty with respect to σ , i.e.,

$$\sigma_{x_s} = 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in \llbracket 1, t-1 \rrbracket. \quad (4.20)$$

In this case, we divide the analysis into two parts. In Section 4.3, assume that

$$\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j} \leq 1. \quad (4.21)$$

We construct a path from $\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{xy}$ as follows (see also Figure 4.2):

- (F) Move m particles from x_{s-1} to x_s consecutively, for each $s \in \llbracket 1, t-1 \rrbracket$. This subpath starts from $\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}$, visits $\sigma_{m-i,i,\ell-m}^{x_{s-1}x_s y}$ for each $i \in \llbracket 0, m \rrbracket$ and $s \in \llbracket 1, t-1 \rrbracket$, and finally arrives at $\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{x_{t-1}y}$.
- (S) Move a particle from x_{t-1} to y . The resulting configuration is $\sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{x_{t-1}y}$. If $m = 1$, the path is complete.
- (B) If $m \geq 2$, move the remaining $m - 1$ particles from x_s to x_{s-1} consecutively, for each $s \in \llbracket 1, t-1 \rrbracket$ (backwards). This subpath starts from $\sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{x_{t-1}y}$, visits $\sigma_{m-i,i-1,\ell-m+1}^{x_{s-1}x_s y}$ for each $i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$ and $s \in \llbracket 1, t-1 \rrbracket$, thereby arrives at $\sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{xy}$ as desired.

Above, letters (F), (S) and (B) stand for *forward*, *single* and *backward*, respectively. Let $\Omega = \Omega^{x,y,\ell,m,\sigma}$ denote the collection of configurations that appear in the aforementioned




FIGURE 4.2. Path of configurations from $\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}$ in Section 4.3. Double arrows indicate series of consecutive jumps. Here, first the stack of m particles at site x moves to x_{t-1} (step **(F)**), then the red particle jumps from site x_{t-1} to y (step **(S)**), and then the remaining stack of $m-1$ particles at site x_{t-1} moves back to x (step **(B)**).

path from $\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}$. Applying (4.14) along the path constructed above, we have the following upper bound for $\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma}$ defined in (4.5):

$$\left(\sum_{\{\eta, \zeta\} \subseteq \Omega} \nabla^2 f(\eta, \zeta) \right) \left(\sum_{\{\eta, \zeta\} \subseteq \Omega} \frac{\mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{c(\eta, \zeta)} \right). \quad (4.22)$$

Referring to the definition of Ω and (4.16), the term inside the second parenthesis in (4.22) expands as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{\pi_x(m) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\pi_{x_{s-1}}(m-i) \pi_{x_s}(i) (m-i) (\alpha_{x_s} + i) c_{x_{s-1}x_s}} + \frac{\pi_x(m)}{\pi_{x_{t-1}}(m) c_{x_{t-1}y}} \\ & + \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\pi_x(m) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\pi_{x_{s-1}}(m-i) \pi_{x_s}(i-1) (i-1) (\alpha_{x_{s-1}} + m-i) c_{x_s x_{s-1}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

First, consider the first (double) summation in (4.23). Via (4.17) and (2.5), we may bound it from above by

$$\frac{1}{c_{\min}} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{\alpha_x e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}} (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\alpha_{x_{s-1}} \alpha_{x_s}} \leq \frac{e k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G)}{c_{\min} \alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}}, \quad (4.24)$$

where we used that $\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j} \leq 1$ from (4.21). Next, the second term in (4.23) can be similarly bounded as

$$\frac{\pi_x(m)}{\pi_{x_{t-1}}(m) c_{x_{t-1}y}} \leq \frac{\alpha_x e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}}}{\alpha_{x_{t-1}} c_{\min}} \leq \frac{e}{c_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}}. \quad (4.25)$$

Similarly, the third (double) summation in (4.23) is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{c_{\min}} \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{i=2}^m \frac{\alpha_x e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}} (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\alpha_{x_{s-1}} \alpha_{x_s}} \leq \frac{e k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G)}{c_{\min} \alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}}. \quad (4.26)$$

Collecting (4.23), (4.24), (4.25) and (4.26), and applying that $\alpha_{\min} \leq \alpha_{\max} + k - 1$ and $k \geq 2$, the term inside the second parenthesis in (4.22) is bounded by

$$\frac{7k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G)}{c_{\min} \alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}}.$$

Thus, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that $\ell \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$, $m \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket$ and $\sigma \in \Xi_{k-\ell}^{V \setminus \{x, y\}}$ satisfy (4.20) and (4.21). Then,*

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} \leq \frac{7k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G)}{c_{\min} \alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}} \left(\sum_{\{\zeta, \zeta'\} \subseteq \Omega} \nabla^2 f(\zeta, \zeta') \right).$$

4.4. Decomposition of gradients: empty sites & many particles. In this subsection, we assume that (4.11), (4.20) hold and that (cf. (4.21))

$$\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j} > 1. \quad (4.27)$$

In this case, constructing a single one-dimensional path is insufficient to bound $\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma}$ properly. The main reason is that in the inequality in (4.24), we are not able to bound the term $e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}}$ with a constant in this new regime (4.27). Having in mind that this term essentially comes from the mechanism that all m particles at x move together, we now avoid this obstacle by sending only a limited amount of particles along the path. This replacement costs us an additional α_x^{-1} term in the upper bound, which is now manageable by the new condition $\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j} > 1$; we refer to (4.39) for the exact place where this point is effectively exploited.

Define a new integer \tilde{m} as

$$\tilde{m} := \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad (4.28)$$

where $\lfloor a \rfloor$ is the greatest integer less than or equal to $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we consider a two-dimensional system of paths from $\sigma_{m, \ell - m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1, \ell - m + 1}^{xy}$ as depicted in Figure 4.3.

In Figure 4.3, the downward vertical arrows starting from $\sigma_{m, \ell - m}^{xy}$ in the top left corner denote the \tilde{m} consecutive particle jumps from x to x_1 . Then, for $i \in \llbracket 1, \tilde{m} \rrbracket$, the i -th bold arrow on the left, from $\sigma_{m-i, i, \ell - m}^{xx_1y}$ to $\sigma_{m-i, i, \ell - m}^{xx_{t-1}y}$, denote the movements of i particles from x_{s-1} to x_s consecutively for each $s \in \llbracket 2, t-1 \rrbracket$, as in mechanism **(F)** in Section 4.3. Next, the middle horizontal arrows denote the single particle jump from x_{t-1} to y , corresponding to mechanism **(S)** in Section 4.3. The bold arrows in the right part denote the movements of $i-1$ particles from x_{t-1} back to x_1 for each $i \in \llbracket 2, \tilde{m} \rrbracket$ (backwards), as in mechanism **(B)** in Section 4.3. Finally, the upward vertical arrows below $\sigma_{m-1, \ell - m + 1}^{xy}$ in the top right corner denote the $\tilde{m} - 1$ consecutive particle jumps from x_1 to x . The values attached to the arrows, roughly speaking, play the role of weights (encoded as the value of the flow, see below) for each move.

To derive an estimate similar to (4.22) that works also in this two-dimensional setting, we make use of some potential-theoretic arguments. We present the statements as concisely as possible and refer the readers to, e.g., [BH15, Chapter 7] or [Kim23, Appendix A] for more details about the objects used in this subsection.

Only in this subsection, we restrict the original system $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$ to the subset depicted in Figure 4.3, which we write as $\Omega = \Omega^{x, y, \ell, m, \sigma}$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{D}_\Omega(g)$ denote the (normalized)

Horizontally, define φ as a constant flow at each i -th vertical level from $\sigma_{m-i,i,\ell-m}^{xx1y}$ to $\sigma_{m-i,i-1,\ell-m+1}^{xx1y}$ with value

$$\frac{\frac{1}{i}}{\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j}}, \quad \text{for each } i \in \llbracket 1, \tilde{m} \rrbracket. \quad (4.32)$$

The function φ is a unit flow from $\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{xy}$. Indeed, letting $(\operatorname{div} \varphi)(\eta)$ denote the net divergence at η , i.e., $(\operatorname{div} \varphi)(\eta) := \sum_{\zeta \in \Omega} \varphi(\eta, \zeta)$, we have

$$(\operatorname{div} \varphi)(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) = 1, \quad (\operatorname{div} \varphi)(\sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{xy}) = -1 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{div} \varphi = 0 \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

Thus, the standard Thomson principle (e.g., [BH15, Theorem 7.37] or [Kim23, Proposition A.2]) indicates that

$$\operatorname{cap}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}, \sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{xy}) \geq \frac{1}{\|\varphi\|^2}, \quad (4.33)$$

where $\|\varphi\|^2$ is the (square) flow norm given by

$$\|\varphi\|^2 := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\eta, \zeta \in \Omega} \frac{\varphi(\eta, \zeta)^2}{\mathfrak{c}(\eta, \zeta)}.$$

Hence, by (4.5), (4.30) and (4.33), we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} \leq \mathcal{D}_\Omega(f) \mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m) \|\varphi\|^2. \quad (4.34)$$

Next, we upper bound the right-hand side of (4.34), except $\mathcal{D}_\Omega(f)$. For this purpose, we decompose $\varphi = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$, where φ_1 (resp. φ_2) indicates the vertical (resp. horizontal) part of φ . First, the (square) flow norm of the vertical part φ_1 reads as

$$\|\varphi_1\|^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{\tilde{m}-1} \frac{(\sum_{j=i+1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2 / (\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2}{\mathfrak{c}(\sigma_{m-i,i,\ell-m}^{xx1y}, \sigma_{m-i-1,i+1,\ell-m}^{xx1y})} + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}-1} \frac{(\sum_{j=i+1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2 / (\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2}{\mathfrak{c}(\sigma_{m-i-1,i,\ell-m+1}^{xx1y}, \sigma_{m-i,i-1,\ell-m+1}^{xx1y})}.$$

Since the two numerators are clearly bounded by 1, we further get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m) \|\varphi_1\|^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\tilde{m}-1} \frac{\mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\mathfrak{c}(\sigma_{m-i,i,\ell-m}^{xx1y}, \sigma_{m-i-1,i+1,\ell-m}^{xx1y})} + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}-1} \frac{\mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\mathfrak{c}(\sigma_{m-i-1,i,\ell-m+1}^{xx1y}, \sigma_{m-i,i-1,\ell-m+1}^{xx1y})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

By the definitions in (4.8) and (4.16), and applying (4.17) and (4.18), the first summation in (4.35) can be bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^{\tilde{m}-1} \frac{\pi_x(m) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\pi_x(m-i) \pi_{x_1}(i) (m-i) (\alpha_{x_1} + i) c_{xx_1}} \\ & \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\tilde{m}-1} e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=m-i}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}} \frac{\alpha_y + \ell - m}{\alpha_{x_1} c_{\min}} \leq \frac{k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1)}{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min}} e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=m-\tilde{m}+1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\sum_{j=m-\tilde{m}+1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j} \leq \log \frac{m-1}{m-\tilde{m}} \leq \log 2$ (cf. (4.28)), we deduce that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\tilde{m}-1} \frac{\mu_{\alpha, k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m (\alpha_y + \ell - m)}{\mathfrak{c}(\sigma_{m-i,i,\ell-m}^{xx1y}, \sigma_{m-i-1,i+1,\ell-m}^{xx1y})} \leq \frac{k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) 2^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min}}. \quad (4.36)$$

Similarly, the second summation in (4.35) can be bounded by the same value in the right-hand side of (4.36). Thus, collecting (4.35) and (4.36), we deduce

$$\mu_{\alpha,k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m(\alpha_y + \ell - m) \|\varphi_1\|^2 \leq \frac{2k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1)2^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min}}. \quad (4.37)$$

Next, the horizontal part $\mu_{\alpha,k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m(\alpha_y + \ell - m) \|\varphi_2\|^2$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} \sum_{s=2}^{t-1} \sum_{i'=0}^{i-1} \frac{\mu_{\alpha,k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m(\alpha_y + \ell - m) \frac{1}{i^2} / (\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2}{\mathfrak{c}(\sigma_{m-i,i-i',i',\ell-m}^{xx_{s-1}x_{sy}}, \sigma_{m-i,i-i'-1,i'+1,\ell-m}^{xx_{s-1}x_{sy}})} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{\mu_{\alpha,k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m(\alpha_y + \ell - m) \frac{1}{i^2} / (\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2}{\mathfrak{c}(\sigma_{m-i,i,\ell-m}^{xx_{t-1}y}, \sigma_{m-i,i-1,\ell-m+1}^{xx_{t-1}y})} \\ & + \sum_{i=2}^{\tilde{m}} \sum_{s=2}^{t-1} \sum_{i'=1}^{i-1} \frac{\mu_{\alpha,k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m(\alpha_y + \ell - m) \frac{1}{i^2} / (\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2}{\mathfrak{c}(\sigma_{m-i,i-i'-1,i',\ell-m+1}^{xx_{s-1}x_{sy}}, \sigma_{m-i,i-i',i'-1,\ell-m+1}^{xx_{s-1}x_{sy}})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

By (4.18), the first (triple) summation in (4.38) can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} \sum_{s=2}^{t-1} \sum_{i'=0}^{i-1} \frac{\pi_x(m) m(\alpha_y + \ell - m) \frac{1}{i^2} / (\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2}{\pi_x(m-i) \pi_{x_{s-1}}(i-i') \pi_{x_s}(i') (i-i') (\alpha_{x_s} + i') c_{x_{s-1}x_s}} \\ & \leq \frac{k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1)}{\alpha_{\min}^2 c_{\min}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} \sum_{s=2}^{t-1} \sum_{i'=0}^{i-1} \frac{e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=m-i}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}}}{i^2 (\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j})^2} \leq \frac{k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) e^{\alpha_x \sum_{j=m-\tilde{m}}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}}}{\alpha_{\min}^2 c_{\min} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{j=m-\tilde{m}}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j} \leq 1 + \log 2 < \log 6$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{1}{j} \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}$ (cf. (4.28)), we may further bound the right-hand side with

$$\frac{2k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) e^{\alpha_x \log 6}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min} \alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}} \leq \frac{2k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}}, \quad (4.39)$$

where in the inequality we used condition (4.27). Similarly, the third (triple) summation in (4.38) is bounded by the same value in the right-hand side of (4.39). Finally, the second summation in (4.38) is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} \frac{\pi_x(m) m}{\pi_x(m-i) \pi_{x_{t-1}}(i) i c_{x_{t-1}y}} \leq \frac{k(k-1)6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min}}. \quad (4.40)$$

Collecting (4.38), (4.39) and (4.40), we obtain

$$\mu_{\alpha,k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m(\alpha_y + \ell - m) \|\varphi_2\|^2 \leq \frac{5k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}}. \quad (4.41)$$

Since φ_1 and φ_2 are disjoint, we have $\|\varphi\|^2 = \|\varphi_1\|^2 + \|\varphi_2\|^2$. Therefore, by (4.37) and (4.41), since $\alpha_{\text{ratio}} \leq 1$, we conclude that

$$\mu_{\alpha,k}(\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}) m(\alpha_y + \ell - m) \|\varphi\|^2 \leq \frac{7k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}}. \quad (4.42)$$

Collecting (4.29), (4.34) and (4.42), we arrive at the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that $\ell \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$, $m \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket$ and $\sigma \in \Xi_{k-\ell}^{V \setminus \{x,y\}}$ satisfy (4.20) and (4.27). Then, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell,m,\sigma} \leq \frac{7k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}} \left(\sum_{\{\zeta,\zeta'\} \subseteq \Omega} \nabla^2 f(\zeta, \zeta') \right).$$

4.5. General case and proof of Theorem 3.2. Now, we handle the general case without the restrictions imposed in the previous four subsections. The idea is to send a particle from x to y along the sequence $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t = y$ by obeying the following two criteria:

- If consecutive sites are occupied by particles in σ , send a single particle along these occupied sites as explained in Section 4.2.
- If consecutive sites are empty for the configuration σ , follow the mechanism explained in Sections 4.3 or 4.4 depending on the size of the stack of particles just before these empty sites.

To state this procedure in a rigorous manner, we decompose $\llbracket 1, t-1 \rrbracket$ as

$$\llbracket 1, b_1 - 1 \rrbracket \cup \llbracket b_1, a_2 - 1 \rrbracket \cup \dots \cup \llbracket a_r, b_r - 1 \rrbracket \cup \llbracket b_r, t - 1 \rrbracket =: O_1 \cup E_1 \cup \dots \cup O_r \cup E_r,$$

where $1 \leq b_1 < a_2 < b_2 < \dots < b_{r-1} < a_r < b_r \leq t$ and

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_{x_s} \geq 1 & \text{if } s \in O_j \text{ for some } j \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket \\ \sigma_{x_s} = 0 & \text{if } s \in E_j \text{ for some } j \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket. \end{cases}$$

Here, letter O (resp. E) stands for *occupied* (resp. *empty*). Also, let $a_1 := 0$ and $a_{r+1} := t+1$. Now, the path from $\sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1, \ell-m+1}^{xy}$ is constructed as follows. Refer to Figure 4.4 for a visual presentation of this recursive procedure.

- [I]** Along $x_{a_j}, \dots, x_{b_j-1}$ for $j \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket$: send a single particle from x_{a_j} to x_{b_j-1} consecutively, as explained in Section 4.2.
- [II]** Along $x_{b_j-1}, \dots, x_{a_{j+1}}$ for $j \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket$ if

$$\alpha_{x_{b_j-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma_{x_{b_j-1}}} \frac{1}{j} \leq 1 :$$

we proceed as in Section 4.3; move all $\sigma_{x_{b_j-1}} + 1$ particles from x_{b_j-1} to $x_{a_{j+1}-1}$ consecutively, move a single particle from $x_{a_{j+1}-1}$ to $x_{a_{j+1}}$, and then move back the remaining $\sigma_{x_{b_j-1}}$ particles at $x_{a_{j+1}-1}$ to x_{b_j-1} backwards.

- [III]** Along $x_{b_j-1}, \dots, x_{a_{j+1}}$ for $j \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket$ if

$$\alpha_{x_{b_j-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{\sigma_{x_{b_j-1}}} \frac{1}{j} > 1 :$$

we proceed as in Section 4.4; move each $i \in \llbracket 1, \lfloor (\sigma_{x_{b_j-1}} + 1)/2 \rfloor \rrbracket$ particles from x_{b_j-1} to $x_{a_{j+1}-1}$ consecutively, move a single particle from $x_{a_{j+1}-1}$ to $x_{a_{j+1}}$, and then move back the remaining $i - 1$ particles at $x_{a_{j+1}-1}$ to x_{b_j-1} backwards.

Again, denote by $\Omega = \Omega^{x,y,\ell,m,\sigma}$ the collection of all configurations that appear along the paths. Then, the explicit results given in Lemmas 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 imply that, in this general case, we also obtain that, for any $\ell \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$, $m \in \llbracket 1, \ell \rrbracket$ and $\sigma \in \Xi_{k-\ell}^{V \setminus \{x,y\}}$,

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell,m,\sigma} \leq \frac{7k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}} \sum_{\{\zeta, \zeta'\} \subseteq \Omega^{x,y,\ell,m,\sigma}} \nabla^2 f(\zeta, \zeta').$$

Note that we used here that $\alpha_{\max} + k - 1 \leq k 6^{\alpha_{\max}}$. Along with (4.6), this implies

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{x,y} \leq \frac{7k(\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} c_{\min}} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \sum_{\sigma \in \Xi_{k-\ell}^{V \setminus \{x,y\}}} \sum_{\{\zeta, \zeta'\} \subseteq \Omega^{x,y,\ell,m,\sigma}} \nabla^2 f(\zeta, \zeta'). \quad (4.43)$$




FIGURE 4.4. Path from $\sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy}$ to $\sigma_{m-1,\ell-m+1}^{xy}$ in the general case explained in Section 4.5. The figure explains how the red particle moves from $x_0 = x$ to $x_t = y$ along the path. First, in O_1 where the sites are occupied, the red particle simply jumps consecutively to the right as explained in Section 4.2. Next, in E_1 where the sites are empty and the initial stack is small, we follow the mechanism presented in Section 4.3 which is divided into three steps **(F)**, **(S)** and **(B)**. In O_2 where the sites are again occupied, we proceed as in Section 4.2. In E_2 where the sites are empty and the initial stack is big, we follow the two-dimensional collection of paths explained in Section 4.4. We iterate these procedures until the red particle arrives at y .

Thus, to conclude the proof of (4.3), according to (4.9) and (4.43), we only need to count the number of *overlaps*, i.e., the number of triples (ℓ, m, σ) in (4.43) that produce the same Dirichlet summand $\nabla^2 f(\eta, \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w)$ in (4.9).

To this end, we fix $x < y$, the sequence $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t = y$ with $t \in \llbracket 1, \text{diam}(G) \rrbracket$, and a triple (η, z, w) in (4.9), and count the number of triples (ℓ, m, σ) that produce the term $\nabla^2 f(\eta, \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w)$ in (4.43) by distinguishing three cases.

(Case 1) There exists no $s \in \llbracket 1, t \rrbracket$ for which $\{x_{s-1}, x_s\} = \{z, w\}$:

Clearly, in this case the overlap is *zero*.

(Case 2) There exists $s \in \llbracket 1, t \rrbracket$ for which $(x_{s-1}, x_s) = (z, w)$:

By the minimal property of the path length t , there is no other $s' \in \llbracket 1, t \rrbracket$ such that $\{x_{s'-1}, x_{s'}\} = \{z, w\}$, thus we may only focus on the particle jump $z \rightarrow w$. First, we observe that if $t = 1$, then the overlap is at most *one*. Thus, we only focus on the case $t \geq 2$. We further divide into three subcases according to the type — **[I]**, **[II]** and **[III]** — of the particle jump $z \rightarrow w$.

- **(Case 2.I)** $\eta \rightarrow \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w$ belongs to type **[I]**:

In this case, recalling that the overall mechanism is to move a single particle from x to y along the path, we obtain

$$\eta = \sigma_{m,\ell-m}^{xy} + (\delta_z - \delta_x).$$

This observation characterizes (ℓ, m, σ) uniquely from the configuration η . Hence, in this subcase, there is exactly *one* overlap.

- **(Case 2.II)** $\eta \rightarrow \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w$ belongs to type **[II]**:

Recall that the mechanism in Section 4.3 is further divided into types **(F)**, **(S)** and **(B)**, where type **(B)** is impossible here since the particle jumps forward. Moreover, this **[II]**-mechanism is happening in $x_{s'}, \dots, x_{s-1}, x_s, \dots, x_{s''}$ with $s' \leq s-1 < s \leq s''$ such that¹

$$\sigma_{x_{s'}} \geq 1, \quad \sigma_{x_{s'+1}} = \dots = \sigma_{x_{s''-1}} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{x_{s''}} \geq 1.$$

¹If $x_{s'} = x$ (resp. $x_{s''} = y$), then condition $\sigma_{x_{s'}} \geq 1$ (resp. $\sigma_{x_{s''}} \geq 1$) should be removed.

First, suppose that $x_{s'} \neq x$. If the jump $\eta \rightarrow \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w$ is of type **(F)**, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \eta + (\eta_w \delta_z - \eta_w \delta_w) \\ &= \sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy} + (\delta_{x_{s'}} - \delta_x) + ((\sigma_{x_{s'}} + 1) \delta_z - (\sigma_{x_{s'}} + 1) \delta_{x_{s'}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the left-hand side detects the moment when the particle jumps $z \rightarrow w$ are about to happen, while the right-hand side is the corresponding configuration represented in terms of (ℓ, m, σ) . This triple is determined uniquely. If $\eta \rightarrow \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w$ is of type **(S)**, then $s = s''$, and we have

$$\eta = \sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy} + (\delta_{x_{s'}} - \delta_x) + ((\sigma_{x_{s'}} + 1) \delta_z - (\sigma_{x_{s'}} + 1) \delta_{x_{s'}}),$$

determining (ℓ, m, σ) uniquely. Thus, we have two possibilities of triples (ℓ, m, σ) . Now, suppose that $x_{s'} = x$. Then, we may similarly detect two possibilities:

$$\eta + (\eta_w \delta_z - \eta_w \delta_w) = \sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy} + (m \delta_z - m \delta_x)$$

for type **(F)**, and

$$\eta = \sigma_{m, \ell-m}^{xy} + (m \delta_z - m \delta_x)$$

for type **(S)**. They both yield a unique triple (ℓ, m, σ) . Therefore, we conclude that **(Case 2.II)** gives rise to at most *two* overlaps.

- **(Case 2.III)** $\eta \rightarrow \eta - \delta_z + \delta_w$ belongs to type **[III]**:

As done in **(Case 2.II)**, we fix $x_{s'}, \dots, x_{s-1}, x_s, \dots, x_{s''}$ on which this **[III]**-mechanism takes place. A forward jump in type **[III]** is of one of the following three types: initial distribution of $i \in \llbracket 1, \tilde{m} \rrbracket$ particles $x_{s'} \rightarrow x_{s'+1}$ (downward arrows in Figure 4.3), movement of i particles in the bulk (bold arrows in the left part of Figure 4.3), or the single particle jump $x_{s''-1} \rightarrow x_{s''}$ (horizontal arrows in the middle part of Figure 4.3). Each type determines a triple (ℓ, m, σ) uniquely, as thoroughly explained in **(Case 2.II)**. Thus, we omit the details here and conclude that no more than *three* overlaps are possible in **(Case 2.III)**.

Collecting these three subcases, **(Case 2)** admits at most *six* overlaps.

(Case 3) There exists $s \in \llbracket 1, t \rrbracket$ for which $(x_{s-1}, x_s) = (w, z)$:

The analysis in this third case is almost identical to the one done in **(Case 2)**. Thus, we choose not to repeat the tedious computations and record here that, also in this case, at most *six* overlaps are possible in **(Case 3)**.

Finally, given $x < y$ and (η, z, w) , collecting **(Case 1)**, **(Case 2)** and **(Case 3)** ensure that there are at most *six* possible overlaps of triples (ℓ, m, σ) . Therefore, by (4.9), we deduce

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{m=1}^{\ell} \sum_{\sigma \in \Xi_{k-\ell}^{V \setminus \{x, y\}}} \sum_{\{\zeta, \zeta'\} \subseteq \Omega^{x, y, \ell, m, \sigma}} \nabla^2 f(\zeta, \zeta') \leq 6 \mathcal{E}.$$

Combining this with (4.43), the proof of (4.3) is now completed.

We now have all we need to complete the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Recall the notation from (4.1). By (4.2) and (4.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_K &\leq \binom{|V|}{2} \frac{42 k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}} \mathcal{E} \\ &\leq \frac{21 k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) |V|^2 \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}} \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

This is exactly the claim in Theorem 3.2. \square

Remark 4.5. The full combination of the three types [I], [II] and [III] is needed to obtain the correct dependence on α_{\min} in Theorem 3.2. Alternatively, we may combine only two of those types (that is, [I] + [II] or [I] + [III]) to obtain different bounds. Here, we briefly record these new results for potential applications in future works.

Recall that we collected (4.24), (4.25), and (4.26) to obtain the exact bound in Lemma 4.3. If we bound $\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}$ from above by $\alpha_{\max} (1 + \log k)$ rather than by 1, we obtain an alternative bound

$$\mathcal{E}_K^{\ell, m, \sigma} \leq \left(2 e^{\alpha_{\max}(1+\log k)} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) \text{diam}(G)}{c_{\min} \alpha_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}} \left(\sum_{\{\zeta, \zeta'\} \subseteq \Omega} \nabla^2 f(\zeta, \zeta') \right),$$

which does not require (4.21). Combining this inequality with Lemma 4.2 and applying the same logic explained in that subsection, we get

$$\mathcal{E}_K \leq \frac{C e^{\alpha_{\max}(1+\log k)} k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) |V|^2 \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min} c_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}}} \mathcal{E}.$$

For simplicity, if we take $\alpha = \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}$ as in (2.7), take $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and neglect the dependence on G and $\hat{\alpha}$, this reduces to

$$\mathcal{E}_K \leq \frac{C_{G, \hat{\alpha}} e^{C_{G, \hat{\alpha}} \varepsilon \log k} k^2}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{E} \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Similarly, if we do not lower bound $\alpha_x \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{j}$ in (4.39) by 1 and repeat the same logic as above, we obtain a different bound

$$\mathcal{E}_K \leq \frac{C k (\alpha_{\max} + k - 1) |V|^2 \text{diam}(G) 6^{\alpha_{\max}}}{\alpha_{\min}^2 c_{\min} \alpha_{\text{ratio}} \log k} \mathcal{E},$$

which then implies, in the asymptotic regime (2.7),

$$\mathcal{E}_K \leq \frac{C_{G, \hat{\alpha}} k^2}{\varepsilon^2 \log k} \mathcal{E} \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

5. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 2.3 AND 2.4

In this section, we prove Theorems 2.3 and 2.4, following the outline of Section 2.4.2. The basic starting idea is to split the infinitesimal generator $L_{G, \alpha, k}$ into two parts: a slow part and a fast part. In view of this decomposition, standard limit theorems for slow-fast systems ensure that, in the small-diffusivity limit, SIP is well approximated by the slow dynamics, after a suitable projection/thermalization according to the fast one. Understanding how and when this projection affects SIP's spectral gap is the main non-trivial task of this section.

Recall from (2.7) that we assume $\alpha = \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}$, where $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_x)_{x \in V}$ are fixed site weights and ε tends to 0. Finally, since the graph G is fixed all throughout the section, we drop it from the notation, and simply write, e.g., $\text{SIP}_k(\alpha) = \text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$ and $L_{\alpha, k} = L_{G, \alpha, k}$.

5.1. Slow and fast dynamics. Fix $k \geq 2$, and consider $\text{SIP}_k(\varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$ with time sped up by a factor ε^{-1} . Recalling (2.1), the corresponding generator is then simply given by $\varepsilon^{-1} L_{\alpha, k} = \varepsilon^{-1} L_{\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}, k}$. By separating the ε -dependent terms from the rest, we obtain

$$\varepsilon^{-1} L_{\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}, k} = A_{\hat{\alpha}, k} + \varepsilon^{-1} B_k, \tag{5.1}$$

where, for all $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ and $\eta \in \Xi_k$,

$$A_{\hat{\alpha}, k} f(\eta) := \sum_{x, y \in V} c_{xy} \eta_x \hat{\alpha}_y (f(\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y) - f(\eta)),$$

$$B_k f(\eta) := \sum_{x,y \in V} c_{xy} \eta_x \eta_y (f(\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y) - f(\eta)) .$$

Let $(\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ and $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ denote the Markov chains in Ξ_k generated by $A_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ and B_k , respectively. More in detail, $(\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ describes k independent particles on G , while $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a particle system with absorbing set

$$\Omega_k := \{\eta \in \Xi_k : c_{xy} \eta_x \eta_y = 0 \text{ for all } x, y \in V\} , \quad (5.2)$$

and transient set $\Delta_k := \Xi_k \setminus \Omega_k$, i.e.,

$$\Delta_k := \{\eta \in \Xi_k : c_{xy} \eta_x \eta_y > 0 \text{ for some } x, y \in V\} . \quad (5.3)$$

Let $\Pi_k : \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ denote the B_k -harmonic projection operator, i.e.,

$$\Pi_k f := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{tB_k} f , \quad f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k} .$$

Remark that the range of Π_k , written as $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_k) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$, is a $|\Omega_k|$ -dimensional subspace.

The following result builds on a powerful theorem [Kur73, Theorem 2.1] (see also [EK86, §1, Theorem 7.6]) on limit theorems for Markovian slow-fast systems.

Proposition 5.1. *The operator $\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ is an infinitesimal generator on $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_k)$. Moreover, for all $t > 0$ and $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$, we have the following semigroups convergence:*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \max_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \left| e^{t(A_{\hat{\alpha},k} + \varepsilon^{-1}B_k)} f(\eta) - e^{t\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}} \Pi_k f(\eta) \right| = 0 . \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. In this proof, we write $P_t^\varepsilon = e^{t(A_{\hat{\alpha},k} + \varepsilon^{-1}B_k)}$. The first claim and a convergence as in (5.4) with $P_t^\varepsilon f(\eta)$ replaced by $P_t^\varepsilon \Pi_k f(\eta)$ are the content of [EK86, §1, Theorem 7.6]. In order to obtain the desired claim (i.e., remove the projection operator Π_k), it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \max_{\eta \in \Xi_k} |P_t^\varepsilon \Pi_k f(\eta) - P_t^\varepsilon f(\eta)| = 0 , \quad t > 0 .$$

For this purpose, fix $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$, and observe that

$$\Pi_k f(\eta) = f(\eta) , \quad \eta \in \Omega_k ,$$

because $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ has Ω_k as absorbing states. Hence, since Π_k is a contraction, we get

$$|P_t^\varepsilon \Pi_k f(\eta) - P_t^\varepsilon f(\eta)| \leq \sum_{\xi \in \Delta_k} p_t^\varepsilon(\eta, \xi) |\Pi_k f(\xi) - f(\xi)| \leq \left(2 \max_{\xi \in \Xi_k} |f(\xi)|\right) p_t^\varepsilon(\eta, \Delta_k) ,$$

where $p_t^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the transition kernel of the ε^{-1} -sped up SIP $_k(\varepsilon\hat{\alpha})$ at time t . Since

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^\varepsilon(\eta, \Delta_k) = 0 , \quad \eta \in \Xi_k , \quad t > 0 ,$$

(see Proposition A.1 below for the full statement and proof of this fact), the proof of the proposition is concluded. \square

Fix $t > 0$, and recall that $e^{t(A_{\hat{\alpha},k} + \varepsilon^{-1}B_k)}$ has all real eigenvalues, just one equal to 1, while all the others lying in the interval $(0, 1)$. Further, Proposition 5.1 ensures that all eigenvalues (with multiplicity) of $e^{t(A_{\hat{\alpha},k} + \varepsilon^{-1}B_k)}$ converge to those of $e^{t\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}}$. In particular, the spectrum of $e^{t\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}}$ entirely lies in $[0, 1]$: $|\Omega_k| - 1$ of these eigenvalues are strictly positive, while the eigenvalue 0 has multiplicity $|\Xi_k| - |\Omega_k| + 1 = |\Delta_k| + 1$.

As a consequence, the second-largest eigenvalue of $e^{t(A_{\hat{\alpha},k} + \varepsilon^{-1}B_k)}$ converges to the second-largest eigenvalue of $e^{t\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}}$, which is given by $e^{-t w_k(\hat{\alpha})}$, where

$$w_k(\hat{\alpha}) := \text{the second-smallest eigenvalue of } -\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k} : \mathcal{R}(\Pi_k) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\Pi_k) . \quad (5.5)$$

Thus, we proved the following claim. (Recall that $\text{gap}_k(\varepsilon\hat{\alpha}) = \text{gap}_k(G, \varepsilon\hat{\alpha})$.)

Corollary 5.2. *For all integers $k \geq 2$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{gap}_k(\varepsilon \hat{\alpha})}{\varepsilon} = w_k(\hat{\alpha}) .$$

In the next subsection, we analyze more in detail the limiting generator $\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ on $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_k) \subset \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ and its block-triangular structure.

5.2. Recurrent and transient states. As already proved in Proposition 5.1, $\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k} : \mathcal{R}(\Pi_k) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\Pi_k)$ is the infinitesimal generator of a Markov chain on Ω_k , hereafter referred to as $(\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$. For notational simplicity, instead of dealing with $\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ on the $|\Omega_k|$ -dimensional subspace $\mathcal{R}(\Pi_k)$ of \mathbb{R}^{Ξ_k} , we shall rather work with the corresponding rate matrix

$$M_{\hat{\alpha},k} = (\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta, \xi))_{\eta, \xi \in \Omega_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Omega_k| \times |\Omega_k|} , \quad (5.6)$$

whose non-diagonal entries read as

$$\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta, \xi) = \sum_{\zeta \in \Xi_k} \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{A}}(\eta, \zeta) \mathbf{P}_{\zeta}^{\mathcal{B}} [\tau_{\xi} = \tau_{\Omega_k}] , \quad (5.7)$$

encoding the jump rate from $\eta \in \Omega_k$ to $\xi \in \Omega_k$. In the above formula, $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{A}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the transition rate function of the process $(\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, whereas $\mathbf{P}^{\mathcal{B}}$ stands for the law of the process $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$, and

$$\tau_{\Omega_k} := \min_{\xi \in \Omega_k} \tau_{\xi} , \quad \text{with } \tau_{\xi} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \mathcal{B}_k(t) = \xi\} .$$

From the form of these rates, we immediately derive a classification of recurrent and transient states for this Markov chain; this will lead to a further characterization of the spectral gap $w_k(\hat{\alpha})$ of $\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}$. We collect this classification in the following proposition; its direct consequence on the spectral gap is the content of the subsequent corollary. Before that, let us introduce, for every integer $m \geq 1$,

$$\Omega_{k,m} := \{\eta \in \Omega_k : |\{x \in V : \eta_x > 0\}| = m\} , \quad (5.8)$$

that is, the set of configurations in Ω_k with m separated stacks of particles (cf. (5.2)). Clearly, $\Omega_{k,m} = \emptyset$ implies $\Omega_{k,m+\ell} = \emptyset$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Further, we have $\Omega_{k,1} \neq \emptyset$, $\Omega_{k,k+1} = \emptyset$, and, thus, $\Omega_k = \sqcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \Omega_{k,m} = \Omega_{k,1} \sqcup \Omega_{k,2} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Omega_{k,k}$.

Proposition 5.3. *For the chain $(\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, the following two claims hold true:*

(a) *For every $m, m' \geq 1$ with $\Omega_{k,m} \neq \emptyset \neq \Omega_{k,m'}$ and $\eta \in \Omega_{k,m}$, we have*

$$\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta, \xi) = 0 , \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \Omega_{k,m'}, \quad m' > m ,$$

while, when $m \geq 2$, there exist $\eta^1, \dots, \eta^{\ell} \in \Omega_{k,m}$ satisfying

$$\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta, \eta^1) \left(\prod_{h=1}^{\ell-1} \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta^h, \eta^{h+1}) \right) \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta^{\ell}, \xi) > 0 , \quad \text{for some } \xi \in \Omega_{k,m'}, \quad m' < m .$$

As a consequence, $\Omega_{k,m}$, $m \geq 2$, consists of transient states only.

(b) *The chain $(\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is irreducible on $\Omega_{k,1} \neq \emptyset$, and the position of the single stack evolves as $\text{RW}(\hat{\alpha})$.*

Proof. (a) The desired claim follows from the connectedness of the graph G , and the observation that the rates $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ in (5.7) describe the following two subsequent mechanisms: a step of the chain $(\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ increases the number of stacks at most by one, creating, in this case, at least two neighboring stacks; the chain $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ forces all neighboring particles to eventually merge into isolated (i.e., non-neighboring) stacks.

(b) Observe that, for all $x, y, z \in V$ with $c_{xz} > 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}_{(k-1)\delta_x + \delta_z}^{\mathcal{B}} [\tau_{k\delta_y} = \tau_{\Omega_{k,1}}] = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{y=z}}{k} + \frac{(k-1)\mathbb{1}_{y=x}}{k},$$

because the trajectories of $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ started from $(k-1)\delta_x + \delta_z \in \Delta_k$ coincide with those of the symmetric random walk on $\llbracket 0, k \rrbracket$ started from $k-1$. Plugging this expression into (5.7), we obtain, for $x \neq y$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha}, k}^{\mathcal{M}}(k\delta_x, k\delta_y) \\ &= \sum_{z \in V} \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha}, k}^{\mathcal{A}}(k\delta_x, (k-1)\delta_x + \delta_z) \mathbf{P}_{(k-1)\delta_x + \delta_z}^{\mathcal{B}} [\tau_{k\delta_y} = \tau_{\Omega_{k,1}}] = k c_{xy} \hat{\alpha}_y \frac{1}{k} = c_{xy} \hat{\alpha}_y, \end{aligned}$$

namely, the transition rates of $\text{RW}(\hat{\alpha})$. Irreducibility is then an obvious consequence of that of $\text{RW}(\hat{\alpha})$. \square

Remark 5.4. The claim in Proposition 5.3(b) is the finite-particle analogue of the metastable picture of SIP, fully detailed in [GRV13, BDG17].

Remark 5.5. For $k \geq m \geq 2$, the dynamics on $\Omega_{k,m} \neq \emptyset$ encoded by $M_{\hat{\alpha}, k}$ goes as follows. All stacks evolve as independent $\text{RW}(\hat{\alpha})$ as long as their mutual distances are at least three. When two or more stacks reach mutual distance two, then there is a positive rate for them to merge. These rates — as well as the new positions of the stacks and their new compositions — depend on G and $\hat{\alpha}$, but also non-trivially on $k \geq m$ and, when $k > m$, on the stacks' composition. For more details, see Section 5.3.2 below.

The state-classification in Proposition 5.3 may be equivalently restated as follows: after a suitable conjugation with a permutation matrix, $M_{\hat{\alpha}, k}$ is turned into a block lower triangular matrix with $M_{\hat{\alpha}, k, 1}, \dots, M_{\hat{\alpha}, k, k}$ as diagonal blocks, where, for all $m \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$,

$$M_{\hat{\alpha}, k, m} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Omega_{k,m}| \times |\Omega_{k,m}|} \quad (5.9)$$

is the submatrix of $M_{\hat{\alpha}, k}$ obtained from the restriction on configurations in $\Omega_{k,m}$ (see Figure 5.2). Since the eigenvalues of block triangular matrices are the union of those of the diagonal blocks, it suffices to focus on the spectrum of the blocks $M_{\hat{\alpha}, k, m}$, $m \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$. As already showed in the previous section, the eigenvalues of $-M_{\hat{\alpha}, k, m}$, $m \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$, are all real and non-negative. Remark that:

- for $m = 1$, the spectrum of $M_{\hat{\alpha}, k, m}$ coincides with that of the generator of $\text{RW}(\hat{\alpha})$;
- for $m \geq 2$ and $\Omega_{k,m} \neq \emptyset$, $M_{\hat{\alpha}, k, m}$ is the rate matrix of a sub-Markovian chain killed upon exiting $\Omega_{k,m}$; thus, all its eigenvalues are strictly negative.

In view of these simple observations, we register the following useful characterization of the spectral gap $w_k(\hat{\alpha})$ defined in (5.5).

Corollary 5.6. *For all $m \geq 2$ such that $\Omega_{k,m} \neq \emptyset$, define*

$$\lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha}) := \text{smallest eigenvalue of the matrix } -M_{\hat{\alpha}, k, m} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\Omega_{k,m}| \times |\Omega_{k,m}|}, \quad (5.10)$$

whereas $\lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha}) := +\infty$ if $\Omega_{k,m} = \emptyset$. Then, we have

$$w_k(\hat{\alpha}) = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(\hat{\alpha}) \wedge \min_{m \in \llbracket 2, k \rrbracket} \lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha}). \quad (5.11)$$

The natural next step is to estimate the eigenvalue $\lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha})$ for each $k \geq 2$ and $m \in \llbracket 2, k \rrbracket$, by bounding it from below by $\lambda_{2,2}(\hat{\alpha})$. This task is carried out in the following two subsections. In the first one, we prove $\lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha}) = \lambda_{m,m}(\hat{\alpha})$; in the second one, we show $\lambda_{m,m}(\hat{\alpha}) \geq \lambda_{2,2}(\hat{\alpha})$.

We conclude this subsection by observing that each submatrix $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}$ in $\Omega_{k,m}$ is self-adjoint with respect to a positive measure $\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}$ given in (5.12) below. On the one hand, this property is interesting and may become handy in future use, e.g., for building an L^2 -theory for the corresponding continuum model. On the other hand, in our storyline, neither this property nor the precise form of the symmetrizing measure are of primary importance. Thus, we only state the full statement here, and postpone its proof to Appendix B.

Lemma 5.7. *For all $m \leq k$, $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}$ is self-adjoint as an operator on $L^2(\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k,m})$, where*

$$\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}(\eta) := \prod_{\substack{x \in V \\ \eta_x > 0}} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_x}{\eta_x}, \quad \eta \in \Omega_{k,m}. \quad (5.12)$$

5.3. Comparing $\lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha})$ with $\lambda_{m,m}(\hat{\alpha})$. The main goal of this subsection is to prove the following result: for all integers $m \geq 2$ with $\Omega_{m,m} \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$\lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha}) = \lambda_{m,m}(\hat{\alpha}), \quad k \geq m. \quad (5.13)$$

We divide the proof of this identity into a few steps, and fix $m \geq 2$ so as to satisfy $\Omega_{m,m} \neq \emptyset$ all throughout.

5.3.1. Consistency. Recall the consistency property (3.1) satisfied by SIP, as well as the corresponding annihilation operator $\mathbf{a}_k : \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ in (3.2). Since $M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ arises as a small-diffusivity limit of SIP, it is natural to expect that an analogous property should hold also for $M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$. This is the content of the following proposition.

Proposition 5.8. *Define, for all integers $k \geq 1$, the following “restricted” annihilation operator $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k : \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{k-1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_k}$ as*

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k g(\eta) := \sum_{x \in V} \eta_x g(\eta - \delta_x), \quad g \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{k-1}}, \quad \eta \in \Omega_k. \quad (5.14)$$

Then, we have

$$M_{\hat{\alpha},k} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_k = \hat{\mathbf{a}}_k M_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}. \quad (5.15)$$

Proof. First of all, observe that, whenever $\eta \in \Omega_k$ with $\eta_x \geq 1$, then necessarily we have $\eta - \delta_x \in \Omega_{k-1}$; thus, the definition of $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k$ makes sense. Hence, in view of the relation between $M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ and $\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k}$, it suffices to show that

$$\Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k} \mathbf{a}_k = \mathbf{a}_k \Pi_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}.$$

It is well known that a system of k independent random walks is consistent, i.e., $A_{\hat{\alpha},k} \mathbf{a}_k = \mathbf{a}_k A_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}$. Moreover, by rewriting the consistency property of $\text{SIP}(\varepsilon \hat{\alpha})$ in (3.1) with the notation in (5.1), we have $(A_{\hat{\alpha},k} + \varepsilon^{-1} B_k) \mathbf{a}_k = \mathbf{a}_k (A_{\hat{\alpha},k-1} + \varepsilon^{-1} B_{k-1})$. Thus, by linearity, we must also have $B_k \mathbf{a}_k = \mathbf{a}_k B_{k-1}$, and a similar relation for the harmonic projection Π_k of B_k . This concludes the proof. \square

5.3.2. Irreducible decompositions. The chain $(\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is not necessarily irreducible on $\Omega_{k,m}$. For instance, when $G = \mathbb{T}_{2m}$ is the one-dimensional discrete torus of size $2m$, $\Omega_{m,m} = \{\eta, \tau_1 \eta\}$ consists of exactly two configurations (one with particles/stacks on the odd numbers, the other one on the even numbers), and $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta, \tau_1 \eta) = \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\tau_1 \eta, \eta) = 0$. Moreover, the structure of the irreducible components of the chain $(\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on $\Omega_{k,m}$ is always *finer* than the corresponding structure on $\Omega_{m,m}$, in the sense of the following proposition.

Proposition 5.9. *Decompose $\Omega_{m,m}$ into irreducible components for the chain $(\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\alpha},m}(t))_{t \geq 0}$: for some integer $\mathbf{n}_m \geq 1$ (depending only on $m \geq 2$ and G),*

$$\Omega_{m,m} = \Omega_{m,m}^1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Omega_{m,m}^{\mathbf{n}_m}. \quad (5.16)$$

For all $k > m$ and $i \in \llbracket 1, \mathbf{n}_m \rrbracket$, define, iteratively,

$$\Omega_{k,m}^i = \{\eta + \delta_x \in \Omega_{k,m} : \eta \in \Omega_{k-1,m}^i, x \in V \text{ such that } \eta_x \geq 1\}. \quad (5.17)$$

Then, there exist partitions $\Omega_{k,m}^i = \Omega_{k,m}^{i,1} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Omega_{k,m}^{i,\mathfrak{N}_i^k}$ for all $i \in \llbracket 1, \mathbf{n}_m \rrbracket$ such that

$$\Omega_{k,m} = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\mathbf{n}_m} \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{N}_i^k} \Omega_{k,m}^{i,j} \quad (5.18)$$

is an irreducible decomposition of $\Omega_{k,m}$ for the chain $(\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$.

Proof. First, the fact that $\Omega_{k,m}$, for each $k \geq m \geq 2$, can be decomposed into irreducible components follows at once from Lemma 5.7. Thus, to prove the validity of Proposition 5.9, it suffices to check the following two properties:

- (a) $\Omega_{k,m} = \Omega_{k,m}^1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Omega_{k,m}^{\mathbf{n}_m}$;
- (b) if $i \neq i'$, $\eta \in \Omega_{k,m}^i$, and $\xi \in \Omega_{k,m}^{i'}$, then η and ξ belong to different irreducible components of $\Omega_{k,m}$ for $(\mathcal{M}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(t))_{t \geq 0}$.

To verify item (a), take $\eta \in \Omega_{k,m}$ and define a new configuration $\eta^* \in \Omega_{m,m}$ as

$$\eta^* := \sum_{\substack{x \in V \\ \eta_x \geq 1}} \delta_x. \quad (5.19)$$

Since η has m separated stacks of particles, indeed η^* belongs to $\Omega_{m,m}$. Then, according to (5.16), $\eta^* \in \Omega_{m,m}^i$ for some i , thus $\eta \in \Omega_{k,m}^i$ by (5.17). This proves that $\Omega_{k,m} = \Omega_{k,m}^1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \Omega_{k,m}^{\mathbf{n}_m}$.

We move on to item (b). It suffices to prove that, for any $\eta, \xi \in \Omega_{k,m}$ with $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta, \xi) > 0$, the corresponding configurations $\eta^*, \xi^* \in \Omega_{m,m}$ (cf. (5.19)) satisfy either $\eta^* = \xi^*$ or $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},m}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta^*, \xi^*) > 0$.

In view of (5.7), there exists $\zeta \in \Xi_k$ such that $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{A}}(\eta, \zeta) > 0$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\zeta}^{\mathcal{B}}[\tau_{\xi} = \tau_{\Omega_k}] > 0$. In turn, there exist $x, y \in V$ with $c_{xy} > 0$ such that $\zeta = \eta - \delta_x + \delta_y$. First, suppose that $\zeta \in \Omega_k$, i.e., $\zeta = \xi$. Then, it is straightforward that $\zeta^* = \xi^* \in \Omega_m$ and $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},m}^{\mathcal{A}}(\eta^*, \zeta^*) > 0$, thus we have $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},m}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta^*, \xi^*) > 0$ by (5.7). On the contrary, suppose that $\zeta \in \Delta_k$. This means that y has at least one neighboring site (possibly x) on which ζ has a particle. We divide into several cases.

1. If $\zeta_x \geq 1$ and $\zeta_z = 0$ for all $z \neq x$ with $c_{yz} > 0$, then the dynamics $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ can only move particles between sites x and y . Thus, by $\mathbf{P}_{\zeta}^{\mathcal{B}}[\tau_{\xi} = \tau_{\Omega_k}] > 0$ it necessarily holds that $\xi = \eta - \eta_x \delta_x + \eta_x \delta_y \in \Omega_k$. This implies that $\xi^* = \eta^* - \delta_x + \delta_y \in \Omega_m$, thus $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},m}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta^*, \xi^*) > 0$.
2. Suppose that $\zeta_x \geq 1$ and there exists $z \neq x$ with $c_{yz} > 0$ such that $\zeta_z \geq 1$. Then, the dynamics $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ gets absorbed exactly when y becomes empty. For ξ to have the same number of stacks, m , as η , it follows that $\xi^* = \eta^*$.
3. Suppose that $\zeta_x = 0$. Then, since the absorption of $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ triggers at least one additional loss of a stack of particles, the absorbed configuration ξ has strictly less number of stacks than η , which contradicts the assumption that $\eta, \xi \in \Omega_{k,m}$.

The above three cases conclude the proof of Proposition 5.9. \square




FIGURE 5.1. The H-shape graph G and the corresponding absorbing spaces $\Omega_{4,4} = \Omega_{4,4}^1$ and $\Omega_{5,4} = \Omega_{5,4}^{1,1} \sqcup \Omega_{5,4}^{1,2}$ explained in Remark 5.10.

Remark 5.10. The irreducible structure in (5.18) may indeed get *strictly* finer than the one in (5.16). For example, consider the following *H-shape* graph G with $V = \llbracket 1, 6 \rrbracket$, $c_{12} = c_{23} = c_{25} = c_{45} = c_{56} = 1$, and $c_{xy} = 0$ otherwise (see Figure 5.1). Then, $\Omega_{4,4}$ is a singleton set with $\Omega_{4,4}^1 = \{\delta_1 + \delta_3 + \delta_4 + \delta_6\}$, whereas $\Omega_{5,4}$ has two irreducible components $\Omega_{5,4}^{1,1}$ and $\Omega_{5,4}^{1,2}$, given as

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{5,4}^{1,1} &= \{2\delta_1 + \delta_3 + \delta_4 + \delta_6, \delta_1 + 2\delta_3 + \delta_4 + \delta_6\} \\ \Omega_{5,4}^{1,2} &= \{\delta_1 + \delta_3 + 2\delta_4 + \delta_6, \delta_1 + \delta_3 + \delta_4 + 2\delta_6\}. \end{aligned}$$

5.3.3. *Conclusion of the proof of (5.13).* Recall the definition of the matrix $M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ and its submatrices $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}$ from (5.6) and (5.9), respectively.

First, we deal with the case $k = m$. We split $M_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}$ into \mathfrak{n}_m diagonal blocks $M_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^1, \dots, M_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^{\mathfrak{n}_m}$, each corresponding to an irreducible sub-Markovian dynamics. Adopting an analogous notation, we further write the eigenvalue $\lambda_{m,m}(\hat{\alpha})$ in (5.10) as

$$\lambda_{m,m}(\hat{\alpha}) = \lambda_{m,m}^1(\hat{\alpha}) \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_{m,m}^{\mathfrak{n}_m}(\hat{\alpha}),$$

where $\lambda_{m,m}^i(\hat{\alpha})$ stands for the smallest eigenvalue of $-M_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i$. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, in view of sub-Markovianity, this eigenvalue is strictly positive. Furthermore, because of irreducibility, this is the only eigenvalue admitting a non-negative (actually, strictly positive) eigenfunction, which we refer to as

$$\psi_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{m,m}^i}.$$

Let, for all $i \in \llbracket 1, \mathfrak{n}_m \rrbracket$,

$$\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i(\eta) := \begin{cases} \psi_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i(\eta) & \text{if } \eta \in \Omega_{m,m}^i \\ 0 & \text{if } \eta \in \Omega_m \setminus \Omega_{m,m}^i, \end{cases} \quad (5.20)$$

be the extension of the eigenfunction $\psi_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{m,m}^i}$ to \mathbb{R}^{Ω_m} . Then, due to the block lower triangular structure of $M_{\hat{\alpha},m}$, we have

$$M_{\hat{\alpha},m} \Psi_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i = -\lambda_{m,m}^i(\hat{\alpha}) \Psi_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i. \quad (5.21)$$

Since $\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_m} \neq 0$, this shows that a straightforward extension of $\psi_{\hat{\alpha},m,m}^i$ produces an eigenfunction for $M_{\hat{\alpha},m}$.

Remark 5.11. This canonical extension works well only for the case $k = m$, while it does not for $k > m$, in view of the block lower triangular structure of $M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$.

For $k > m$, we follow a different route. In view of Proposition 5.9, as done above for $k = m$, we split $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}$ into $\mathfrak{N}_1^k + \cdots + \mathfrak{N}_{n_m}^k$ diagonal blocks, say, $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j}$ for $i \in \llbracket 1, n_m \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, \mathfrak{N}_i^k \rrbracket$, each corresponding to the irreducible sub-Markovian dynamics on $\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}$. We refer to Figure 5.2 below for the overall structure of the matrix $M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$. Then, we write the eigenvalue $\lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha})$ in (5.10) as

$$\lambda_{k,m}(\hat{\alpha}) = \min_{i \in \llbracket 1, n_m \rrbracket} \min_{j \in \llbracket 1, \mathfrak{N}_i^k \rrbracket} \lambda_{k,m}^{i,j}(\hat{\alpha}), \quad (5.22)$$

where $\lambda_{k,m}^{i,j}(\hat{\alpha})$ is the smallest eigenvalue of $-M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j}$, which admits a strictly positive eigenfunction $\psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}}$, again by the Perron-Frobenius theorem.

Now, instead of the canonical extension as in (5.20), we define $\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_k}$ as the ‘‘lifting’’ of $\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},m}^i$ through the annihilation operators in (5.14):

$$\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i := (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_k \circ \cdots \circ \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{m+1}) \Psi_{\hat{\alpha},m}^i.$$

By the intertwining relation (5.15) and the eigenvalue equation (5.21), we readily obtain

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\hat{\alpha},k} \Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i &= M_{\hat{\alpha},k} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_k \cdots \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{m+1} \Psi_{\hat{\alpha},m}^i \\ &= \hat{\mathbf{a}}_k \cdots \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{m+1} M_{\hat{\alpha},m} \Psi_{\hat{\alpha},m}^i = -\lambda_{m,m}^i(\hat{\alpha}) \Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

Since $\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i \neq 0$, the above identity ensures that $\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_k}$ is an eigenfunction for $-M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ associated to the eigenvalue $\lambda_{m,m}^i(\hat{\alpha})$. Moreover, by (5.14) and (5.20), we have

$$\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i(\eta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \eta \in \Omega_{k,m'}^i, \quad m' < m.$$

Because of the block lower triangular structure of $M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ and the irreducible decomposition (5.18), this ensures that the restriction

$$\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i \Big|_{\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}}$$

of $\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_k}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}}$ is an eigenfunction for $-M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j}$ with corresponding eigenvalue $\lambda_{m,m}^i(\hat{\alpha})$. Finally, by the aforementioned positivity of $\psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{k,m}^i}$, we have

$$\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i(\eta) > 0, \quad \text{for all } \eta \in \Omega_{k,m}^i.$$

(see Figure 5.2 for a visual proof). Since $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j}$ admits $\psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}}$ as the only positive eigenfunction (up to constant multiples), we must have

$$\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i \Big|_{\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}} = c \psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j} \quad \text{for some } c > 0,$$

and, thus, $\lambda_{m,m}^i(\hat{\alpha}) = \lambda_{k,m}^{i,j}(\hat{\alpha})$. By (5.22), the desired claim in (5.13) follows.

5.4. $\lambda_{k,k}(\hat{\alpha})$ and k coalescing particles. In this subsection, we prove

$$\lambda_{k,k}(\hat{\alpha}) \geq \lambda_{2,2}(\hat{\alpha}), \quad k \geq 2. \quad (5.24)$$

Assuming that $\Omega_{k,k} \neq \emptyset$, and recalling the definition of Dirichlet forms and norms from Section 3.1, our first observation is the following variational formula for $\lambda_{k,k}(\hat{\alpha})$:

$$\lambda_{k,k}(\hat{\alpha}) = \inf_{\substack{f \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\Xi_k} \\ f=0 \text{ on } \Xi_k \setminus \Omega_{k,k}}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(f)}{\|f\|_{\hat{\alpha},k}^2}. \quad (5.25)$$

Indeed, as a straightforward inspection of the rates $\mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ in (5.7) shows, the matrix $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,k}$ describes the dynamics of k indistinguishable particles, all evolving as independent

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Omega_{k,1} \\
\Omega_{k,2} \\
\vdots \\
\Omega_{k,m} \\
\vdots
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
M_{k,1} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \\
\star \quad \begin{array}{c} \ddots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad \mathbf{M}_{k,2}^{i,j} \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad \ddots \end{array} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \\
\star \quad \star \quad \ddots \quad \mathbf{0} \quad \mathbf{0} \\
\star \quad \star \quad \star \quad \begin{array}{c} \ddots \quad 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad \mathbf{M}_{k,m}^{i,j} \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \quad \ddots \end{array} \quad \mathbf{0} \\
\star \quad \star \quad \star \quad \star \quad \ddots
\end{array}
= \begin{array}{c}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
\star \\
\color{red}{\blacktriangle} \\
\star \\
\star
\end{array}
= \begin{array}{c}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
\star \\
\color{red}{\blacktriangledown} \\
\star \\
\star
\end{array}$$

$M_k \qquad \Psi_{k,m}^i \qquad -\lambda_{m,m}^i \Psi_{k,m}^i$

FIGURE 5.2. In this figure, we depict the eigenvalue equation in (5.23) (for simplicity, we dropped $\hat{\alpha}$ from the notation). On the left-hand side, we show the $|\Omega_k| \times |\Omega_k|$ matrix $M_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ in its block lower triangular form. Stars (\star) indicate some possibly non-zero entries; triangles (\blacktriangle , resp. \blacktriangledown) strictly positive (resp. negative) ones. The diagonal blocks in bold are the $|\Omega_{k,m}| \times |\Omega_{k,m}|$ -matrices $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}$, $m \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$, defined in (5.9). Furthermore, each $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}$, $m \geq 2$, is further decomposed into block diagonal matrices $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j}$, $i \in \llbracket 1, \mathfrak{n}_m \rrbracket$, $j \in \llbracket 1, \mathfrak{N}_i^k \rrbracket$. Focusing on the red region $\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}$, we readily verify that $\Psi_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^i|_{\Omega_{k,m}^{i,j}}$ is a strictly positive eigenfunction of $M_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}^{i,j}$ associated to $-\lambda_{m,m}^i(\hat{\alpha})$.

RW($\hat{\alpha}$) as long as their mutual graph-distances are at least two, which get instantaneously killed as soon as at least one of them attempts a jump to a site neighboring another particle. The right-hand side of (5.25) is then readily obtained because SIP particles evolve as independent random walks as long as they are not neighbors, and $\Xi_k \setminus \Omega_{k,k}$ plays the role of a cemetery state. In light of this reformulation, the inequality in (5.24) is, at least intuitively, expected: in a system of $k \geq 2$ independent particles, the rate for the first touch of at least two of them cannot decrease as k grows.

The remainder of this subsection is devoted to the rigorous proof of this fact, whose key step is based on the following comparisons.

Lemma 5.12. *For all integers $k \geq 3$ and any function $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ which vanishes on $\Xi_k \setminus \Omega_{k,k}$, define $(f_\xi(\delta_x) := f(\xi + \delta_x))$*

$$g(\xi) = g_f(\xi) := \|f_\xi\|_{\hat{\alpha},2} = \sqrt{\sum_{x \in V} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_x}{|\hat{\alpha}|} f(\xi + \delta_x)^2}, \quad \xi \in \Xi_{k-1}.$$

Then, g vanishes on $\Xi_{k-1} \setminus \Omega_{k-1,k-1}$, and we have

$$\|g\|_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}^2 = \frac{|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1}{|\hat{\alpha}|} \|f\|_{\hat{\alpha},k}^2, \quad \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}(g) \leq \frac{|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1}{|\hat{\alpha}|} \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(f). \quad (5.26)$$

By applying Lemma 5.12 to the function $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ attaining the infimum in the variational formula in (5.25), we obtain

$$\lambda_{k,k}(\hat{\alpha}) = \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(f)}{\|f\|_{\hat{\alpha},k}^2} \geq \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}(gf)}{\|gf\|_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}^2} \geq \lambda_{k-1,k-1}(\hat{\alpha}),$$

which, by iteration over $k \geq 3$, yields (5.24).

Proof of Lemma 5.12. Since $f = 0$ on $\Xi_k \setminus \Omega_{k,k}$, we similarly have $g = 0$ on $\Xi_{k-1} \setminus \Omega_{k-1,k-1}$, because $\xi \in \Xi_{k-1} \setminus \Omega_{k-1,k-1}$ implies $\xi + \delta_x \in \Xi_k \setminus \Omega_{k,k}$ for all $x \in V$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\alpha}| \|g\|_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}^2 &= \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}} \sum_{x \in V} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}(\xi) \hat{\alpha}_x f_\xi(\delta_x)^2 \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}} \sum_{x \in V} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}(\xi) (\hat{\alpha}_x + \xi_x) f_\xi(\delta_x)^2 \\ &= \frac{|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1}{k} \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}} \sum_{x \in V} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi + \delta_x) (\xi_x + 1) f_\xi(\delta_x)^2 \\ &= \frac{|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1}{k} \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}} \sum_{x \in V} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi + \delta_x) f_\xi(\delta_x)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where for the second and fourth identities we used that $f = 0$ on $\Xi_k \setminus \Omega_{k,k}$, whereas for the third one we applied (3.8). Since each $\eta = \xi + \delta_x \in \Omega_{k,k}$ is counted exactly k times in the above double summation, we deduce

$$|\hat{\alpha}| \|g\|_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}^2 = (|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1) \sum_{\eta \in \Omega_{k,k}} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\eta) f(\eta)^2 = (|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1) \|f\|_{\hat{\alpha},k}^2.$$

This proves the identity in (5.26). As for the inequality therein, recall

$$\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}(g) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}(\xi) \sum_{x,y \in V} c_{xy} \xi_x \hat{\alpha}_y (g(\xi) - g(\xi - \delta_x + \delta_y))^2.$$

By applying the triangle inequality

$$(g(\xi) - g(\xi - \delta_x + \delta_y))^2 \leq \sum_{z \in V} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_z}{|\hat{\alpha}|} (f_\xi(\delta_z) - f_\xi(\delta_z - \delta_x + \delta_y))^2,$$

for any $\xi \in \Xi_{k-1}$ satisfying $\xi_x \geq 1$, we get that $|\hat{\alpha}| \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}(g)$ is bounded above by

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k-1}(\xi) \sum_{x,y,z \in V} c_{xy} \xi_x \hat{\alpha}_y \hat{\alpha}_z (f_\xi(\delta_z) - f_\xi(\delta_z - \delta_x + \delta_y))^2.$$

Now, fix $\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}$ and $x, y, z \in V$ such that $c_{xy} > 0$. If $\xi_z \geq 1$, then both $\xi + \delta_z$ and $\xi + \delta_z - \delta_x + \delta_y$ belong to $\Xi_k \setminus \Omega_{k,k}$, the subset on which $f = 0$. Hence, by (3.8), the expression above reads as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1}{2k} \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}} \sum_{z \in V} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi + \delta_z) \sum_{x,y \in V} c_{xy} \xi_x \hat{\alpha}_y (f_\xi(\delta_z) - f_\xi(\delta_z - \delta_x + \delta_y))^2 \\ &\leq \frac{|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1}{2k} \sum_{\xi \in \Omega_{k-1,k-1}} \sum_{z \in V} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi + \delta_z) \sum_{x,y \in V} c_{xy} (\xi + \delta_z)_x \hat{\alpha}_y (f_\xi(\delta_z) - f_\xi(\delta_z - \delta_x + \delta_y))^2 \\ &= \frac{|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1}{2} \sum_{\eta \in \Omega_{k,k}} \mu_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\eta) \sum_{x,y \in V} c_{xy} \eta_x \hat{\alpha}_y (f(\eta) - f(\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y))^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$= (|\hat{\alpha}| + k - 1) \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\alpha},k}(f),$$

where for the third line we used again the change of variables $\eta = \xi + \delta_z \in \Omega_{k,k}$. This concludes the proof. \square

5.5. Proofs of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4. We are finally ready to prove Theorems 2.3 and 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. By Corollary 5.2 and (5.11),

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{gap}_k(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})}{\varepsilon} = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha}) \wedge \min_{m \in \llbracket 2, k \rrbracket} \lambda_{k,m}(G, \hat{\alpha}), \quad (5.27)$$

whereas by (5.22), (5.13) and (5.24),

$$\min_{m \in \llbracket 2, k \rrbracket} \lambda_{k,m}(G, \hat{\alpha}) = \lambda_{2,2}(G, \hat{\alpha}).$$

Hence, since the limit in (5.27) is strictly positive, Theorem 2.3 holds true. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Recall that, for all graphs G and site weights $\hat{\alpha}$, we have $\text{gap}_1(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}) = \varepsilon \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha})$, $\varepsilon > 0$; moreover, by (5.27) for $k = 2$, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{gap}_2(G, \varepsilon \hat{\alpha})}{\varepsilon} = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha}) \wedge \lambda_{2,2}(G, \hat{\alpha}).$$

Thus, it suffices to verify the existence of G and $\hat{\alpha}$ such that

$$\lambda_{2,2}(G, \hat{\alpha}) < \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \hat{\alpha}). \quad (5.28)$$

In particular, let us recall from the discussion in Section 5.4, that $\lambda_{2,2}$ is the smallest eigenvalue of (the negative of) the generator describing two independent $\text{RW}(G, \hat{\alpha})$, having $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_x)_{x \in V}$ as a (non-normalized) reversible measure, and which get instantaneously killed when attempting to get to a mutual graph-distance strictly smaller than two.

In view of this, it is not surprising that the standard discrete torus \mathbb{T}_N^d , with dimension $d \geq 2$, size $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and homogeneous site weights, satisfies (5.28), provided that N is large enough. From now on, we fix $\hat{\alpha} \equiv 1$ and

$$G = \mathbb{T}_N^d, \text{ with } c_{xy} \equiv 1 \text{ for all neighboring sites } x, y \in \mathbb{T}_N^d,$$

and drop them from the notation, simply writing, e.g., $\lambda_{2,2}$ and gap_{RW} instead of $\lambda_{2,2}(G, \hat{\alpha})$ and $\text{RW}(G, \hat{\alpha})$.

Consider the positions $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of two independent particles on \mathbb{T}_N^d , each one jumping with unit rate to any of its neighbors. Observe that $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is reversible with respect to the uniform measure $\kappa = \kappa_{N,d}$ on $\mathbb{T}_N^d \times \mathbb{T}_N^d$. In what follows, let $\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}$ denote the law and corresponding expectation for $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ when starting from $(x, y) \in \mathbb{T}_N^d \times \mathbb{T}_N^d$. It is well known (see, e.g., [LP17, Sections 12.3.1 & 12.4]) that, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough and all $d \geq 1$, we have

$$\text{gap}_{\text{RW}} \geq \frac{\pi^2}{4N^2}. \quad (5.29)$$

Letting

$$\mathcal{W} := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{T}_N^d : \text{dist}_{\mathbb{T}_N^d}(x, y) \geq 2\},$$

by the second inequality in [Her23, Eq. (1.7)], we have

$$\lambda_{2,2} \leq \frac{1}{\max_{\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}_{\kappa(\cdot|\mathcal{U})}[\tau_{\mathcal{U}^c}]} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_{\kappa(\cdot|\mathcal{W})}[\tau_{\mathcal{W}^c}]}, \quad (5.30)$$

where in the second step we substituted $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{W}$. The last denominator in (5.30) is almost the mean meeting time of two independent random walks, both being uniformly distributed

on \mathbb{T}_N^d (and independently) at time $t = 0$. This latter quantity is known [Cox89, Theorem 4] to asymptotically diverge, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, like s_N , where

$$s_N := \begin{cases} N^2 \log N & \text{if } d = 2, \\ N^d & \text{if } d \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad (5.31)$$

In the remainder of this proof, we show that the denominator in (5.30) follows the same asymptotic behavior.

Since $\kappa(\mathcal{W}) = 1 - \frac{2d+1}{N^d}$, we calculate

$$\mathbb{E}_{\kappa(\cdot|\Omega)}[\tau_{\mathcal{W}^c}] = \left(1 - \frac{2d+1}{N^d}\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{N^{2d}} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[\tau_{\mathcal{W}^c}]. \quad (5.32)$$

Moreover, since $Z_t := X_t - Y_t \in \mathbb{T}_N^d$ is a simple random walk (jumping to a nearest neighbor at rate 2), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}[\tau_{\mathcal{W}^c}] = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{x-y}[\widehat{\tau}_1], \quad (x,y) \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (5.33)$$

where we use the hat-notation to refer to quantities related to Z_t , while $\widehat{\tau}_\ell$, $\ell \in \llbracket 0, \lfloor N/2 \rrbracket \rrbracket$, denotes the first hitting time of the set

$$\{z \in \mathbb{T}_N^d : \text{dist}_{\mathbb{T}_N^d}(z, 0) = \ell\}.$$

By the strong Markov property and translation invariance of the dynamics, we have

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{x-y}[\widehat{\tau}_0] = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{x-y}[\widehat{\tau}_1] + \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{e_1}[\widehat{\tau}_0] = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{x-y}[\widehat{\tau}_1] + \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_0[\widehat{\tau}_0^+] - \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_0[\widehat{\tau}_1],$$

where $\widehat{\tau}_0^+$ denotes the first return time to 0 for the walk Z_t started in 0, i.e.,

$$\widehat{\tau}_0^+ := \inf\{t > \widehat{\tau}_1 : Z_t = 0\}.$$

Clearly, $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_0[\widehat{\tau}_1] = \frac{1}{4d}$, while, by Kac's formula for return times (see, e.g., [AF02, p. 34, Lemma 2.25]), we obtain

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_0[\widehat{\tau}_0^+] = \frac{N^d}{4d}.$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N^{2d}} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{W}} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{x-y}[\widehat{\tau}_1] &= \frac{1}{N^{2d}} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{W}} \left(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{x-y}[\widehat{\tau}_0] - \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_0[\widehat{\tau}_0^+] + \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_0[\widehat{\tau}_1] \right) \\ &\geq \left\{ \frac{1}{N^{2d}} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{W}} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}_{x-y}[\widehat{\tau}_0] \right\} - \frac{N^d}{4d}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

By [Cox89, Theorem 4] (see also [Dur24, Lemma 7.3.2] for a more recent textbook version), the expression between curly brackets is, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, bounded below by $\mathfrak{g}_d s_N$, for some positive constant \mathfrak{g}_d (which, for $d \geq 3$, is strictly larger than $\frac{1}{4d}$, cf. [Cox89, Eq. (1.2)]). Hence, collecting (5.32), (5.33) and (5.34), we obtain, for some $C = C_d > 0$ and for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\kappa(\cdot|\mathcal{W})}[\tau_{\mathcal{W}^c}] \geq C s_N,$$

which, along with (5.30), implies

$$\lambda_{2,2} \leq \frac{1}{C s_N}.$$

Comparing this inequality with (5.29) (cf. (5.31)) completes the proof of the theorem. \square

6. NON-CONSERVATIVE SIP. SETTING AND MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we attach particle reservoirs to some sites of the graph. We describe this by introducing two sets of non-negative site parameters, $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x \in V}$ and $\theta = (\theta_x)_{x \in V}$. The former one represents the rates of interaction between a site and its reservoir. The latter one prescribes the reservoirs' particle densities. Next to the inclusion particles' motion considered so far, we now let particles be created and annihilated with rates resembling those of SIP.

6.1. Model. Let $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$ be as in Section 2, and introduce some non-negative site weights $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x \in V}$ and $\theta = (\theta_x)_{x \in V}$. Then, we write $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha, \omega, \theta)$ for the Markov process on² $\Xi := \cup_{k=0}^{\infty} \Xi_k$ with infinitesimal generator $L_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta}$ given, for a bounded function $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi}$ and a configuration $\eta \in \Xi$, by

$$\begin{aligned} L_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta} f(\eta) &= \sum_{x, y \in V} c_{xy} \eta_x (\alpha_y + \eta_y) (f(\eta - \delta_x + \delta_y) - f(\eta)) \\ &+ \sum_{x \in V} \omega_x \left\{ \eta_x (1 + \theta_x) (f(\eta - \delta_x) - f(\eta)) + \theta_x (\alpha_x + \eta_x) (f(\eta + \delta_x) - f(\eta)) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Here, the first summation on the right-hand side corresponds with the conservative dynamics described by $L_{G, \alpha, k}$ in (2.1), and is referred to as bulk dynamics. The second summation concerns the particle creation-annihilation mechanism, and may be interpreted as a bulk-boundary dynamics. More in detail, particles at $x \in V$ get killed independently, each at rate $\omega_x (1 + \theta_x)$, while a new particle is created at $x \in V$ with a configuration-dependent rate $\omega_x \theta_x (\alpha_x + \eta_x)$. Furthermore, albeit the configuration space Ξ is countably infinite, $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha, \omega, \theta)$ does not explode in finite time. Indeed, the total number of particles is stochastically dominated by a pure birth process with linearly growing rates (see, e.g., [FGS22, Proposition 2.1]).

The long-time behavior of $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha, \omega, \theta)$ clearly depends on the values of ω and θ . To start with, we mention that $\omega_x = 0$ means that site $x \in V$ does not directly exchange particles with any reservoirs, whereas $\theta_x = 0$ corresponds to having a purely absorbing reservoir at $x \in V$. As a consequence, if $\omega \equiv 0$, we recover the conservative case having, for any total number of particles $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_{\alpha, k}$ in (2.2) as a unique reversible measure. If $\theta \equiv 0$ and $\omega \not\equiv 0$, the system eventually empties out. In other words, if θ vanishes on the support of ω , that is,

$$\text{supp}(\omega) := \{x \in V : \omega_x > 0\},$$

then $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha, \omega, \theta)$ has the empty configuration $\emptyset \in \Xi_0$ as its unique stationary state, which, in turn, is absorbing. More generally, for $\omega \not\equiv 0$, there exists a unique stationary measure for $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha, \omega, \theta)$, referred to as $\mu_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta}$. In this situation, one typically distinguishes between two scenarios, commonly referred to as equilibrium and non-equilibrium, respectively.

More in detail, *equilibrium* occurs if θ is constant on $\text{supp}(\omega)$. In this case, it is well-known that $\mu_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta}$ is reversible, in product form, and explicit: assuming that $\theta \equiv \varrho > 0$, then $\mu_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta} = \nu_{\alpha, \varrho}$, where, for all $\eta \in \Xi$,

$$\nu_{\alpha, \varrho}(\eta) := \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha, \varrho}} \left(\frac{\varrho}{1 + \varrho} \right)^{|\eta|} \prod_{x \in V} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_x + \eta_x)}{\Gamma(\alpha_x) \eta_x!}, \quad \text{with } \mathcal{Z}_{\alpha, \varrho} := (1 + \varrho)^{|\alpha|}. \quad (6.2)$$

Note that $\mu_{\alpha, k}$ in (2.2) is the canonical measure associated to the grand-canonical $\nu_{\alpha, \varrho}$. One speaks of *non-equilibrium* if θ is non-constant on $\text{supp}(\omega)$. Then, $\mu_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta}$ is, in general,

² $\Xi_0 := \{\emptyset\}$ consists of the empty configuration \emptyset with no particles.

neither reversible, nor in product form, nor explicit. We will not need to know more on the structure of this steady state; for further details, see, e.g., [FRS22] and references therein.

6.2. Spectral gap identity when $\theta \equiv 0$. We start with the analysis of the purely absorbing SIP. As already anticipated in Section 1.4, we shall see that understanding the case $\theta \equiv 0$ is one of the key ingredients for the spectral analysis of the setting with general θ .

Observe that substituting $\theta \equiv 0$ in (6.1) gives rise to a system in which all particles are never created, and get annihilated one at the time, until the system eventually gets empty. In particular, $L_{G,\alpha,\omega,0}$, interpreted as an infinite matrix, is similar to a block lower triangular one. Moreover, the blocks on the diagonal — each for any total number of particles $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ in the bulk of the system — are of finite size and describe the following finite-state Markov chains. The case $k = 1$ corresponds to a process with just one particle in the bulk, which moves as $\text{RW}(G, \alpha)$ defined in Section 2, additionally killed at rate $\omega_x \geq 0$ when sitting on $x \in V$. We refer to this process as $\text{RW}(G, \alpha, \omega)$. The case $k \geq 2$ is similar, with k interacting particles evolving in the bulk as $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$, each independently killed with rate $\omega_x \geq 0$ when sitting at $x \in V$. Each of these Markov chains, say $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha, \omega)$, are sub-stochastic. Moreover, since the conservative $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha)$ admits $\mu_{\alpha,k}$ in (2.2) as its unique reversible measure, all eigenvalues of (the negative of) the generator of $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha, \omega)$ (see (7.1)) are real and strictly positive. Letting $\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha, \omega)$, $k \geq 1$, be the lowest of such eigenvalues, we write (cf. (2.4))

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha, \omega) = \inf_{k \geq 2} \text{gap}_k(G, \alpha, \omega) . \quad (6.3)$$

Similarly, we introduce the spectral gap of $\text{RW}(G, \alpha, \omega)$ as

$$\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha, \omega) = \text{gap}_1(G, \alpha, \omega) . \quad (6.4)$$

Our main result of this section establishes that, as soon as the killing rate ω is not identically zero, the spectral gaps in (6.3) and (6.4) coincide, regardless of the underlying geometry and of the site weights — even when $\alpha_{\min} \in (0, 1)$. This spectral gap identity stands in stark contrast to the behavior observed in the conservative setting, where restrictions are imposed on the value of α_{\min} .

Theorem 6.1 ($\theta \equiv 0$). *For all graphs $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$, and site weights $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$, $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x \in V}$ with $\omega \neq 0$, we have*

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha, \omega) = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha, \omega) .$$

Remarkably, the proof of the above identity (deferred to Section 7.1) is quite elementary.

6.3. General setting. When dealing with the general case $\theta \neq 0$, we must specify the infinite-dimensional function analytic setting that we work in. For this purpose, we define a class of functions on Ξ (Definition 6.2), written in terms of orthogonal “Meixner” polynomial dualities introduced in [FRS22, Section 4], which take the following form: for all $\varrho \geq 0$,

$$D_{\alpha,\varrho}(\xi, \eta) = \prod_{x \in V} d_{\alpha_x, \varrho}(\xi_x, \eta_x) , \quad \eta \in \Xi , \quad \xi \in \Xi_k , \quad k \geq 0 , \quad (6.5)$$

where, for $\varrho = 0$,

$$d_{\alpha_x, 0}(\xi_x, \eta_x) = \frac{\eta_x!}{(\eta_x - \xi_x)! \Gamma(\alpha_x + \xi_x)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_x \leq \eta_x\}} ,$$

whereas, for $\varrho > 0$,

$$d_{\alpha_x, \varrho}(\xi_x, \eta_x) = \sum_{\ell_x=0}^{\xi_x} \binom{\xi_x}{\ell_x} d_{\alpha_x, 0}(\ell_x, \eta_x) (-\varrho)^{\xi_x - \ell_x} = (-\varrho)^{\xi_x} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -\xi_x - \eta_x \\ \alpha_x \end{matrix} ; -\frac{1}{\varrho} \right] .$$

This last identity is just a rewriting in terms of the ordinary hypergeometric function. Let us observe that $D_{\alpha,\varrho}(\emptyset, \cdot) \equiv 1$ and that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi \in \Xi_k$, $\eta \in \Xi \mapsto D_{\alpha,\varrho}(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a k -th order polynomial in $\eta = (\eta_x)_{x \in V}$. Moreover, as we shall show in Section 7.2 below,

$$\{D_{\alpha,\varrho}(\xi, \cdot) : |\xi| \leq k\}$$

is a linearly independent set which spans the space of polynomials in η of order $\leq k$. This and the two other properties presented in Proposition 7.2 below turn the functions in (6.5) into a convenient basis of polynomials on Ξ .

Definition 6.2. For all $\varrho > 0$, integers $k \geq 1$, and functions $\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$, define

$$F_{\alpha,\varrho}^\psi(\eta) := \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha,k}(\xi) \psi(\xi) D_{\alpha,\varrho}(\xi, \eta), \quad \eta \in \Xi. \quad (6.6)$$

When $k = 0$ and, thus, $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ is a scalar, we conventionally set $F_{\alpha,\varrho}^\psi \equiv \psi \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark that, as long as $\psi \neq 0$, the function in (6.6) is a non-vanishing k -th order polynomial in the variables $\eta = (\eta_x)_{x \in V}$. In particular, expressions like $L_{G,\alpha,\omega,\theta} F_{\alpha,\varrho}^\psi$ will always be well defined. Finally, introduce the operators $\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha,\omega,\varrho,k-1}^\theta : \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_{k-1}}$, $k \geq 1$, acting on functions $\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ as

$$\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha,\omega,\varrho,k-1}^\theta \psi(\zeta) := k \sum_{x \in V} \omega_x (\theta_x - \varrho) \frac{\alpha_x + \zeta_x}{|\alpha| + k - 1} \psi(\zeta + \delta_x), \quad \zeta \in \Xi_{k-1}. \quad (6.7)$$

Clearly, we have

$$\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha,\omega,\varrho,k-1}^\theta = 0, \quad \text{if } \theta \equiv \varrho. \quad (6.8)$$

The following theorem, whose proof is postponed to Section 7.2 below, is stated for any graph G and site weights α , ω , and θ .

Theorem 6.3. Fix $\varrho > 0$ and recall Definition 6.2.

(a) Given $k \geq 0$, any eigenpair λ, ψ of the k -particle purely-absorbing system solves

$$L_{G,\alpha,\omega,\theta} F_{\alpha,\varrho}^\psi = -\lambda F_{\alpha,\varrho}^\psi + F_{\alpha,\varrho}^{\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha,\omega,\varrho,k-1}^\theta \psi}. \quad (6.9)$$

(b) The functions $F_{\alpha,\varrho}^\psi$ as in Definition 6.2 may be chosen to form an orthogonal basis of $L^2(\nu_{\alpha,\varrho})$.

Let us comment on two powerful consequences of the above theorem in the reversible case $\theta \equiv \varrho$ (we discuss the non-reversible case in Remark 6.5 below). The first item tells us that any eigenvalue of the purely absorbing system with $k \geq 1$ particles is one also for the general system and, moreover, it provides a constructive procedure to build eigenfunctions from those of the k -particle absorbing system. Indeed, by (6.8), the identity in (6.9) becomes the eigenvalue equation

$$L_{G,\alpha,\omega,\theta} F_{\alpha,\varrho}^\psi = -\lambda F_{\alpha,\varrho}^\psi,$$

because the second term on the right-hand side of (6.9) vanishes when $\theta \equiv \varrho$. The second item guarantees the existence of a c.o.n.s. of eigenfunctions of $L_{G,\alpha,\omega,\theta}$. This, combined with the fact that the generator is self-adjoint in the associated L^2 -space, ensures that $-L_{G,\alpha,\omega,\theta}$ has a pure point spectrum therein, all contained in $[0, \infty)$, with a gap after the zero eigenvalue coinciding with that of the purely absorbing system. Letting

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha, \omega, \varrho)$$

denote this spectral gap when $\theta \equiv \varrho > 0$, Theorem 6.1 readily implies the following result.

Corollary 6.4 ($\theta \equiv \varrho$). *For all graphs $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$, and site weights $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$, $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x \in V}$ with $\omega \neq 0$, we have*

$$\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha, \omega, \varrho) = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha, \omega), \quad \varrho > 0.$$

Remark 6.5 (Non-reversible setting). In view of Theorem 6.3, it is plausible to expect that Corollary 6.4 should extend, in some sense, to the non-reversible setting as well. Indeed, since the two functions on the right-hand side of (6.9) are polynomials of order k and $\ell \leq k-1$, this guarantees that λ therein lies in the point spectrum of $L_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta}$, for all $\theta = (\theta_x)_{x \in V}$. However, in absence of a natural Hilbert space ensuring that such eigenfunctions form a c.o.n.s. when $\theta \not\equiv \text{const.}$ on $\text{supp}(\omega)$, the presence, e.g., of a continuous part of the spectrum (a property which also depends on the choice of the underlying reference function space) is what Theorem 6.3 does not exclude.

Remark 6.6 (Symmetric exclusion processes & Co.). The proof of Theorem 6.3(a)—based on orthogonal-polynomial dualities, annihilation and creation operators—carries over to other non-equilibrium systems enjoying similar properties, e.g., [RS18, FRS22, GRT24]. As an example, we mention the symmetric (partial) exclusion process in contact with reservoirs (see, e.g., [FRS22, Sal23, Sal24]), whose generator is readily obtained from $L_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta}$ in (6.1) by further imposing $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta = (\theta_x)_{x \in V} \in [0, 1]$, and changing the plus signs in $\alpha_x + \eta_x$ and $1 + \theta_x$ therein into minus signs. In this case, the configuration space is simply $\prod_{x \in V} \{0, 1, \dots, \alpha_x\}$, thus, is finite, and the technical issues explained in Remark 6.5 do not arise in this context: the spectrum is just the union of finitely-many eigenvalues, which, in view of the generalized eigenvalue equation in (6.9), are independent of θ .

7. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 6.1 AND 6.3

The following two sections may be essentially read independently.

7.1. Proof of Theorem 6.1. For every $k \geq 1$, the k -particle purely absorbing system (i.e., when $\theta \equiv 0$) is described by the infinitesimal generator

$$L_{G, \alpha, \omega, k} f(\eta) := L_{G, \alpha, k} f(\eta) - f(\eta) \sum_{x \in V} \omega_x \eta_x, \quad (7.1)$$

where $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$, $\eta \in \Xi_k$, and $L_{G, \alpha, k}$ given in (2.1). Note that, when the process is in configuration $\eta \in \Xi_k$, it gets killed with rate $\sum_{x \in V} \omega_x \eta_x \geq 0$.

Recall the definition of the probability measure $\mu_{\alpha, k}$ in (2.2). Since $L_{G, \alpha, \omega, k}$ is the sum of a self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\mu_{\alpha, k})$ and a multiplicative one, it is self-adjoint on $L^2(\mu_{\alpha, k})$ and, thus, all the eigenvalues of $-L_{G, \alpha, \omega, k}$ are real and non-negative. Additionally, since the conservative dynamics is irreducible and the multiplication operator is non-positive, all such eigenvalues are actually strictly positive. In particular, we obtain that $\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha, \omega)$, the lowest of such eigenvalues, is positive and, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, characterized as the worst-case exponential killing rate for large times: letting τ_k denote the first time at which one of the k particles gets killed,

$$\text{gap}_k(G, \alpha, \omega) = - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \max_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \mathbb{P}_{\eta}^{G, \alpha, \omega, k}(\tau_k > t).$$

Thanks to this asymptotic identity, the assertion of Theorem 6.1 boils down to show that, for all $k \geq 2$,

$$\max_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \mathbb{P}_{\eta}^{G, \alpha, \omega, k}(\tau_k > t) \leq \max_{x \in V} \mathbb{P}_{\delta_x}^{G, \alpha, \omega, 1}(\tau_1 > t), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (7.2)$$

For this purpose, we introduce a lockdown representation of the particle system with killing, extending the one known within the conservative setting [KS24, Appendix A]. We

need to introduce a bit of notation. For every $k \geq 2$, labeled configuration $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in V^k$, and permutation $\varsigma \in S_k$, we write $\varsigma \mathbf{x} = (x_{\varsigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\varsigma(k)}) \in V^k$. Further, $\mathcal{S}_k : \mathbb{R}^{V^k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V^k}$ denotes the symmetrization operator, that is,

$$\mathcal{S}_k \varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\varsigma \in S_k} \varphi(\varsigma \mathbf{x}), \quad \varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{V^k},$$

whereas $\Phi_k(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \delta_{x_i} \in \Xi_k$ is the operator which removes the particles' labels.

Proposition 7.1 (Lookdown representation of SIP with killing). *For all $k \geq 2$, we have*

$$\mathcal{S}_k \mathcal{L}_{G,\alpha,\omega,k}(f \circ \Phi_k) = (L_{G,\alpha,\omega,k} f) \circ \Phi_k, \quad f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}, \quad (7.3)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{G,\alpha,\omega,k}$ denotes the generator of the lookdown $\text{SIP}_k(G, \alpha, \omega)$ given, for all $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{V^k}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in V^k$, by

$$\mathcal{L}_{G,\alpha,\omega,k} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{L}_{G,\alpha,k} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) - \varphi(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{i=1}^k \omega_{x_i}. \quad (7.4)$$

Here, $\mathcal{L}_{G,\alpha,k} \varphi(\mathbf{x})$ reads as

$$\mathcal{L}_{G,\alpha,k} \varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{x,y \in V} c_{xy} \delta_{x,x_i} \left(\alpha_y + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_{y,x_j} \right) (\varphi(\mathbf{x}_i^y) - \varphi(\mathbf{x})),$$

and stands for the conservative part of the lookdown dynamics, with $\mathbf{x}_i^y \in V^k$ denoting the configuration obtained from $\mathbf{x} \in V^k$ by setting the i -th coordinate equal to $y \in V$.

Proof. By [KS24, Proposition A.4], an identity which is analogous to that in (7.3) holds for the conservative dynamics, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S}_k \mathcal{L}_{G,\alpha,k}(f \circ \Phi_k) = (L_{G,\alpha,k} f) \circ \Phi_k, \quad f \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}.$$

Hence, by linearity, it suffices to prove the identity only for the multiplication operators in (7.1) and (7.4) describing the killing part. Nevertheless, this identity holds trivially because particles are killed independently (or, equivalently, because $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \mapsto (f \circ \Phi_k)(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{i=1}^k \omega_{x_i}$ is invariant under permutations). \square

Let $\mathcal{P}_t^{G,\alpha,\omega,k} = e^{t \mathcal{L}_{G,\alpha,\omega,k}}$, $t \geq 0$, be the lookdown semigroup. In conclusion, taking $f = \mathbb{1}_{\Xi_k} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ in (7.3) and observing that $\mathbb{1}_{\Xi_k} \circ \Phi_k = (\otimes_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}_V) \in \mathbb{R}^{V^k}$, we obtain, for all $\mathbf{x} \in V^k$ and $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \mathbb{P}_\eta^{G,\alpha,\omega,k}(\tau_k > t) &\leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in V^k} \mathcal{P}_t^{G,\alpha,\omega,k}(\otimes_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}_V)(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \max_{x \in V} \mathcal{P}_t^{G,\alpha,\omega,1} \mathbb{1}_V(x), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from neglecting all particles with labels $\ell = 2, \dots, k$ (in other words, bounding $\otimes_{i=2}^k \mathbb{1}_V \leq 1$), the first being independent from them. Since this last expression equals the right-hand side of (7.2), this proves the inequality therein and, thus, concludes the proof of Theorem 6.1.

7.2. Proof of Theorem 6.3. Our main ingredient will be the duality property of SIP in contact with reservoirs (e.g., [GKRV09, CGGR13]), in particular, the orthogonal polynomial duality functions found in [FRS22]. We shall not assume any prior knowledge on this topic, but rather exploit a few properties taken from [KLS10, RS18, FRS22], which, for the reader's convenience, we collect in the following proposition. For notational convenience, we simply write $L_\theta = L_{G,\alpha,\omega,\theta}$ and $L_k = L_{G,\alpha,\omega,k}$ (defined in (6.1) and (7.1), respectively).

Proposition 7.2. Fix $\varrho > 0$.

(a) Orthogonality and completeness. Let $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\alpha, \varrho}$ denote the inner product in $L^2(\nu_{\alpha, \varrho})$ (see (6.2)). Then, for all integers $k, \ell \geq 1$ and $\xi \in \Xi_k, \zeta \in \Xi_\ell$,

$$\langle D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\xi, \cdot) | D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\zeta, \cdot) \rangle_{\alpha, \varrho} = \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi=\zeta\}} \frac{\varrho^k (1 + \varrho)^k}{Z_{\alpha, k}} \mu_{\alpha, k}(\xi)^{-1} . \quad (7.5)$$

Moreover, $\{D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\xi, \cdot)\}_{k \geq 0, \xi \in \Xi_k}$ is a complete system of $L^2(\nu_{\alpha, \varrho})$.

(b) Duality. For all $\theta = (\theta_x)_{x \in V}$ and $\eta \in \Xi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_\theta D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\xi, \cdot)(\eta) &= L_k D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\cdot, \eta)(\xi) \\ &+ \sum_{x \in V} \omega_x \xi_x (\theta_x - \varrho) D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\xi - \delta_x, \eta) . \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

Remark 7.3. Since $\{D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\xi, \cdot)\}_{\ell \leq k, \xi \in \Xi_\ell}$ spans all polynomials of order $\leq k$, by (7.6), $L_\theta = L_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta}$ leaves invariant such a subspace of polynomials.

The rest of the proof of Theorem 6.3 is routine. Indeed, Theorem 6.3(a) follows by linearity and the duality relation in (7.6): recalling $F_{\alpha, \varrho}^\psi$ from Definition 6.2, first we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L_\theta F_{\alpha, \varrho}^\psi(\eta) &= \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha, k}(\xi) \psi(\xi) L_\theta D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\xi, \cdot)(\eta) \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha, k}(\xi) \psi(\xi) L_k D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\cdot, \eta)(\xi) \\ &+ \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha, k}(\xi) \psi(\xi) \sum_{x \in V} \omega_x \xi_x (\theta_x - \sigma) D_\sigma(\xi - \delta_x, \eta) , \end{aligned}$$

which, rewritten in terms of the operator $\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha, \omega, \varrho, k-1}^\varrho$ in (6.7), rearranges as

$$\sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha, k}(\xi) \psi(\xi) L_k D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\cdot, \eta)(\xi) + F_{\alpha, \varrho}^{\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha, \omega, \varrho, k-1}^\varrho} .$$

By the symmetry of L_k in $L^2(\mu_{\alpha, k})$, we finally obtain

$$L_\theta F_{\alpha, \varrho}^\psi(\eta) = \sum_{\xi \in \Xi_k} \mu_{\alpha, k}(\xi) L_k \psi(\xi) D_{\alpha, \varrho}(\xi, \eta) + F_{\alpha, \varrho}^{\mathfrak{b}_{\alpha, \omega, \varrho, k-1}^\varrho} ,$$

and the desired claim follows if $L_k \psi = -\lambda \psi$.

The second item in Theorem 6.3 is a direct consequence of the symmetry of L_k in $L^2(\mu_{\alpha, k})$ (thus, the orthogonality relation of eigenfunctions $\psi, \varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_l}$ associated to distinct eigenvalues) and the orthogonality relation in (7.5): for all integers $k, \ell \geq 0$, all eigenfunctions $\psi \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_k}$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{\Xi_\ell}$ of L_k and L_ℓ , respectively, we have

$$\langle F_{\alpha, \varrho}^\psi | F_{\alpha, \varrho}^\varphi \rangle_{\alpha, \varrho} = \mathbb{1}_{\{k=\ell\}} \mathfrak{c}_{\alpha, \varrho, k} \langle \psi | \varphi \rangle_{\alpha, k} ,$$

for some constant $\mathfrak{c}_{\alpha, \varrho, k} > 0$. The completeness is standard and left to the reader.

8. EXTENSIONS AND RELATED MODELS

In this last section, we extend our results to the Brownian energy process, and briefly discuss their connections with what is known for some closely related models.

8.1. Brownian energy process. Given a graph $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$ and site weights $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$, the corresponding Brownian energy process — referred to as $\text{BEP}(G, \alpha)$ — is the diffusion on the probability simplex

$$\Sigma := \left\{ \zeta \in [0, 1]^V : \sum_{x \in V} \zeta_x = 1 \right\}, \quad (8.1)$$

with infinitesimal generator

$$\mathcal{L}_{G, \alpha} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x, y \in V} c_{xy} \left\{ -(\alpha_y \zeta_x - \alpha_x \zeta_y) (\partial_{\zeta_x} - \partial_{\zeta_y}) + \zeta_x \zeta_y (\partial_{\zeta_x} - \partial_{\zeta_y})^2 \right\},$$

and the following Dirichlet distribution on Σ as its unique reversible measure

$$\gamma_\alpha(d\zeta) = \left(\frac{1}{\mathbb{B}(\alpha)} \prod_{x \in V} \zeta_x^{\alpha_x - 1} \right) d\zeta, \quad \text{with } \mathbb{B}(\alpha) := \frac{\prod_{x \in V} \Gamma(\alpha_x)}{\Gamma(|\alpha|)}. \quad (8.2)$$

Here, $d\zeta$ stands for the uniform measure on Σ . We refer to Section 1, [KS24] and references therein, for more information and history on this model. Here, we just mention that its mean field version (i.e., when $c_{xy} \equiv \text{const.}$) coincides with the renowned multi-type Wright-Fisher diffusion with parent independent mutations (see, e.g., [Shi77, WZ19]).

As shown in [KS24], $\text{BEP}(G, \alpha)$ inherits its eigenstructure from that of $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha)$. More precisely, the Poisson intertwining relation [KS24, Eq. (4.1)] between the generators $\mathcal{L}_{G, \alpha}$ and $L_{G, \alpha, k}$ allows to lift eigenfunctions of $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha)$ to eigenfunctions of $\text{BEP}(G, \alpha)$, both corresponding to the same eigenvalue. Using this intertwining relation and the fact $\mathcal{L}_{G, \alpha}$ is a self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\gamma_\alpha)$, one concludes that this lifting saturates all the info on the spectrum and, in particular, the corresponding spectral gaps coincide

$$\text{gap}_{\text{BEP}}(G, \alpha) = \text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha).$$

Combining the findings in [KS24] with our Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 on $\text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha)$, we readily deduce the following analogues of (1.3) and (1.6).

Corollary 8.1. *For all graphs $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$ and site weights $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$, we have*

$$\alpha_{\min} \left\{ \frac{1}{21} \frac{\alpha_{\text{ratio}}}{6^{\alpha_{\min}/\alpha_{\text{ratio}}}} \frac{c_{\min}}{|V|^2 \text{diam}(G)} \right\} \leq \text{gap}_{\text{BEP}}(G, \alpha) \leq \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha),$$

and, in some cases, we have

$$\text{gap}_{\text{BEP}}(G, \alpha) \not\leq \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha).$$

Interestingly, also our results on the spectrum of the non-conservative SIP, via similar arguments, translate to the context of the BEP. Indeed, the aforementioned Poisson intertwining is effective also when one adds the interaction with external reservoirs. As shown, e.g., in [GRT24, Section 4.1], using this operator, the generator $L_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta}$ in (6.1) of $\text{SIP}(G, \alpha, \omega, \theta)$ satisfies, for all $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x \in V}$ and $\theta = (\theta_x)_{x \in V}$, an analogous intertwining relation with

$$\mathcal{L}_{G, \alpha, \omega, \theta} = \mathcal{L}_{G, \alpha} + \sum_{x \in V} \omega_x \left\{ (\alpha_x \theta_x - \zeta_x) \partial_{\zeta_x} + \theta_x \zeta_x \partial_{\zeta_x}^2 \right\},$$

the generator of what we refer to as $\text{BEP}(G, \alpha, \omega, \theta)$.

When $\theta \equiv \varrho > 0$, this non-conservative diffusion on $[0, \infty)^V$ is well known to have the following product measure $\gamma_{\alpha, \varrho} = \otimes_{x \in V} \text{Gamma}(\alpha_x, \varrho)$ as its unique reversible measure. Hence, arguing as above, we derive the corresponding spectral gap identity

$$\text{gap}_{\text{BEP}}(G, \alpha, \omega, \varrho) = \text{gap}_{\text{SIP}}(G, \alpha, \omega, \varrho),$$

and, as a consequence, the following analogue of Corollary 6.4.

Corollary 8.2. *For all graphs $G = (V, (c_{xy})_{x,y \in V})$, and site weights $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in V}$, $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x \in V}$ with $\omega \neq 0$, we have*

$$\text{gap}_{\text{BEP}}(G, \alpha, \omega, \varrho) = \text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha, \omega), \quad \varrho > 0,$$

where $\text{gap}_{\text{RW}}(G, \alpha, \omega)$ is defined in (6.4).

8.2. Other models. As already anticipated in Section 1, SIP and BEP come with several closely related models, having a different dynamics, but exactly the same steady states. The models we have in mind fall into the class of mass redistribution models. Here, we shall focus only on those models with configuration-independent edge updates (see, e.g., [Sas15] and references therein for configuration-dependent mass redistribution models with Dirichlet-type steady states): after an edge, say xy , is selected with rate $c_{xy} \geq 0$, particles/energies sitting on x and y get randomly redistributed therein. Among them, let us mention:

- (a) the Beta-Binomial splitting process and its continuous version, also known as Beta splitting process or (generalized) KMP model (see, e.g., [PR23, DMFG24, GRT24]);
- (b) the discrete and continuous harmonic processes (see, e.g., [FFG23, GRT24]).

All models in (a) and (b) have been studied in their conservative and non-conservative variants (see the aforementioned references for the precise definitions of the redistribution rules), and, just like SIP and BEP, discrete and corresponding continuous models are isospectral (when reversible), enjoying completely analogous Poisson intertwining relations.

To the best of our knowledge, the only sharp quantitative results on their convergence to equilibrium are confined to a handful of results, see [CCL03, Smi14, CLL20, PR23] and references therein. For what concerns the spectral gap, the only sharp results that we are aware of concern the Beta and Beta-Binomial splitting processes in two specific settings, both conservative:

- (i) the complete graph with $\alpha \equiv \text{const.}$ [CCL03] (see also [CLL20, Remark 4]);
- (ii) the segment with $\alpha \equiv \text{const.} \geq 1$ [CLL20].

In particular, in (i), the gap is attained by the system with $k = 2$ particles (which is strictly smaller than gap_1), while in (ii) it coincides with that of the corresponding single particle.

In order to obtain spectral gap asymptotics for small diffusivity, the proof ideas of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 apply also to these models (actually, with considerable simplifications due to the presence of edge updates only, and edges are a.s. never updated simultaneously). For instance, it is not difficult to show that, on graphs like that in Section 5.5 and for α small enough, the spectral gap of the two particles must be strictly smaller than that of the single random walk. Similarly, the non-conservative (reversible) models satisfy a one-particle spectral gap identity, analogous to the one contained in Corollary 6.4. Indeed, the key step in that proof (Section 7.1) carries over to these other models in contact with reservoirs without much changes, because of the analogous intertwining and consistency/duality relations available also for them, see, e.g., [GRT24]. We leave the verification of these claims to the interested reader. What remains largely open is the problem of obtaining spectral gap's sharp lower bounds — and, possibly, identities in terms of simpler processes — for the conservative variants of these mass redistribution models on general geometries.

APPENDIX A. BEING IN Ω_k AT EACH POSITIVE TIME

In this appendix, we prove a technical result on the probability that the ε^{-1} -accelerated SIP sits in the absorbing set Ω_k (see (5.2)) at a given positive time. Since $\Omega_k = \Xi_k$ when $k = 1$, we fix $k \geq 2$ all throughout this appendix.

We use the notation employed in Section 5. Recall from the proof of Proposition 5.1 that $p_t^\varepsilon(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the transition kernel of the ε^{-1} -sped up SIP($G, \varepsilon\hat{\alpha}$) with k particles, i.e.,

$$p_t^\varepsilon(\eta, \xi) = e^{t\varepsilon^{-1}L_{\varepsilon\hat{\alpha},k}} \mathbf{1}_\xi(\eta), \quad \eta, \xi \in \Xi_k.$$

The following proposition is the main result of this appendix.

Proposition A.1. *For any configuration $\eta \in \Xi_k$ and positive time $t > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} p_t^\varepsilon(\eta, \Omega_k) = 1.$$

To prove Proposition A.1, we need a series of technical lemmas. Let $(\eta^\varepsilon(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be the ε^{-1} -sped up SIP with generator $\varepsilon^{-1}L_{\varepsilon\hat{\alpha},k}$. Let $\mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{E}_\eta^\varepsilon$ denote the law and corresponding expectation of $(\eta^\varepsilon(t))_{t \geq 0}$ starting from $\eta \in \Xi_k$.

The first lemma states that the time to reach the absorbing set Ω_k from the transient collection Δ_k (defined in (5.3)) is uniformly negligible. Given a subset A of Ξ_k , let τ_A be its (random) first hitting time. Moreover, define

$$c_{\min} = \min_{\substack{x,y \in V \\ c_{xy} > 0}} c_{xy} > 0, \quad c_{\max} = \max_{x,y \in V} c_{xy}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Lemma A.2. *Suppose that $\varepsilon|\hat{\alpha}| \leq \frac{c_{\min}}{4c_{\max}k}$. Then, for some $C = C(G) > 0$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $k \geq 2$,*

$$\max_{\zeta \in \Delta_k} \mathbb{E}_\zeta^\varepsilon[\tau_{\Omega_k}] \leq \frac{C\varepsilon}{c_{\min}} \log k.$$

Proof. Define a test function $\phi : \Xi_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\phi(\eta) := - \sum_{x \in V} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{\eta_x} \right).$$

Then, there exists $C = C(G) > 0$ such that

$$\max_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \phi(\eta) - \min_{\eta \in \Xi_k} \phi(\eta) \leq \frac{C}{4} \log k. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For each $\zeta \in \Delta_k$, we may express $L_{\varepsilon\hat{\alpha},k}\phi(\zeta)$ as

$$\sum_{\{x,y\} \subseteq V} c_{xy} [\zeta_x (\varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_y + \zeta_y) (\phi(\zeta - \delta_x + \delta_y) - \phi(\zeta)) + \zeta_y (\varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_x + \zeta_x) (\phi(\zeta - \delta_y + \delta_x) - \phi(\zeta))]. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

If $\zeta_x, \zeta_y \geq 1$, then the term inside the bracket in (A.3) becomes

$$\frac{\zeta_x}{\zeta_y + 1} + \frac{\zeta_y}{\zeta_x + 1} + \varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_y \left(1 - \frac{\zeta_x}{\zeta_y + 1} \right) + \varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_x \left(1 - \frac{\zeta_y}{\zeta_x + 1} \right) \geq \frac{(1 - \varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_y)\zeta_x}{\zeta_y + 1} + \frac{(1 - \varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_x)\zeta_y}{\zeta_x + 1}.$$

By the assumption, we have $\varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_{\max} \leq \varepsilon|\hat{\alpha}| \leq \frac{c_{\min}}{4c_{\max}k} < \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, the right-hand side is bounded from below by

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\zeta_x}{\zeta_y + 1} + \frac{\zeta_y}{\zeta_x + 1} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the inequality holds because $\zeta_x, \zeta_y \geq 1$. Next, if $\zeta_x \geq 1$ and $\zeta_y = 0$, then the term inside the bracket in (A.3) equals

$$\zeta_x \varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_y \left(\frac{1}{\zeta_x} - 1 \right) = -\varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_y (\zeta_x - 1) \geq -\varepsilon\hat{\alpha}_y \zeta_x. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Similarly, if $\zeta_x = 0$ and $\zeta_y \geq 1$, then the term is at least $-\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}_x \zeta_y$. As $\zeta \in \Delta_k$, there exists at least one $\{x^*, y^*\}$ such that $c_{x^*y^*} > 0$ and $\zeta_{x^*}, \zeta_{y^*} \geq 1$. Thus, by (A.1), (A.3), (A.4), and (A.5),

$$L_{\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}, k} \phi(\zeta) \geq \frac{c_{x^*y^*}}{2} - \sum_{\substack{x \in V \\ \zeta_x \geq 1}} \sum_{\substack{y \in V \\ \zeta_y = 0}} c_{xy} \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}_y \zeta_x \geq \frac{c_{\min}}{2} - c_{\max} k \varepsilon |\hat{\alpha}| \geq \frac{c_{\min}}{4}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where the last inequality holds since $\varepsilon |\hat{\alpha}| \leq \frac{c_{\min}}{4 c_{\max} k}$.

Now, it is well known that

$$\phi(\eta^\varepsilon(t)) - \phi(\eta^\varepsilon(0)) - \int_0^t (\varepsilon^{-1} L_{\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}, k} \phi)(\eta^\varepsilon(s)) ds, \quad t \geq 0,$$

is a $\mathbb{P}_\zeta^\varepsilon$ -martingale. Setting $t = \tau_{\Omega_k} \wedge r$, applying (A.2) and (A.6), taking expectations with respect to $\mathbb{E}_\zeta^\varepsilon$, and then sending $r \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\frac{c_{\min} \varepsilon^{-1}}{4} \mathbb{E}_\zeta^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Omega_k}] \leq \mathbb{E}_\zeta^\varepsilon \left[\int_0^{\tau_{\Omega_k}} (\varepsilon^{-1} L_{\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}, k} \phi)(\eta^\varepsilon(s)) ds \right] \leq \frac{C}{4} \log k.$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

For each $t \geq 0$, let $T_\varepsilon(t)$ be the local time spent by $(\eta^\varepsilon(s))_{s \geq 0}$ in Ω_k up to time t :

$$T_\varepsilon(t) := \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\{\eta^\varepsilon(s) \in \Omega_k\} ds. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Then, let $S_\varepsilon(s)$, $s \geq 0$, be its generalized inverse:

$$S_\varepsilon(s) := \sup \{t \geq 0 : T_\varepsilon(t) \leq s\}.$$

By definition, $T_\varepsilon(S_\varepsilon(s)) = s$ and $T_\varepsilon(S_\varepsilon(s) + u) > s$ for any $s \geq 0$ and $u > 0$. In turn, we have

$$\eta^\varepsilon(S_\varepsilon(s)) \in \Omega_k, \quad s \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Note also that $\{S_\varepsilon(s) \geq s + u\} = \{T_\varepsilon(s + u) \leq s\}$ for $s \geq 0$ and $u > 0$.

Lemma A.3. *For all $\eta \in \Xi_k$, $t \geq 0$ and $\delta > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [S_\varepsilon(t) \geq t + \delta] = 0.$$

Proof. First, suppose that $\eta \in \Delta_k$. We may bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [S_\varepsilon(t) \geq t + \delta] &= \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [T_\varepsilon(t + \delta) \leq t] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [T_\varepsilon(t + \delta) \leq t, \tau_{\Omega_k} < \delta/2] + \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Omega_k} \geq \delta/2]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.2 and the Markov inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Omega_k} \geq \delta/2] \leq \frac{2}{\delta} \mathbb{E}_\eta^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Omega_k}] \leq \frac{2}{\delta} \frac{C \varepsilon}{c_{\min}} \log k \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Thus, by the strong Markov property of $(\eta^\varepsilon(s))_{s \geq 0}$ and the fact that $t \mapsto T_\varepsilon(t)$ is non-decreasing, we deduce

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [S_\varepsilon(t) \geq t + \delta] \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\xi \in \Omega_k} \mathbb{P}_\xi^\varepsilon [T_\varepsilon(t + \delta/2) \leq t].$$

Thus, it suffices to prove Lemma A.3 for $\eta \in \Omega_k$.

It remains to prove that, for $\eta \in \Omega_k$, $t \geq 0$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [T_\varepsilon(t + \delta) \leq t] = 0.$$

Let $0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots$ be the consecutive jump times from Ω_k to Δ_k . Then, for any integer $m \geq 1$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [T_\varepsilon(t + \delta) \leq t] \leq \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [T_\varepsilon(t + \delta) \leq t, \tau_{m+1} > t + \delta] + \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\tau_{m+1} \leq t + \delta]. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Conditioned on the first event in the right-hand side of (A.9), there occurs at most m jumps from Ω_k to Δ_k up to time $t + \delta$. Let $\tau'_1 < \tau'_2 < \dots$ denote the consecutive return times to Ω_k , such that we have

$$0 < \tau_1 < \tau'_1 < \tau_2 < \tau'_2 < \dots.$$

Then, by (A.7), we may bound the first probability in the right-hand side of (A.9) by

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [(\tau'_1 - \tau_1) + (\tau'_2 - \tau_2) + \dots + (\tau'_m - \tau_m) \geq \delta].$$

We may further bound this by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\tau'_i - \tau_i \geq \delta/m] &\leq m \sup_{\zeta \in \Delta_k} \mathbb{P}_\zeta^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Omega_k} \geq \delta/m] \\ &\leq \frac{m^2}{\delta} \sup_{\zeta \in \Delta_k} \mathbb{E}_\zeta^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Omega_k}] \leq \frac{m^2 C \varepsilon \log k}{\delta c_{\min}} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Here, the first inequality is due to the strong Markov property at τ_i for each $i \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$, the second inequality is due to the Markov inequality, and the third inequality is due to Lemma A.2. Further, for $(\eta^\varepsilon(s))_{s \geq 0}$, any direct jump from Ω_k to Δ_k has rate bounded above by

$$\sup_{\eta \in \Omega_k} \sup_{x, y \in V} \varepsilon^{-1} c_{xy} \eta_x \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}_y \leq c_{\max} k \hat{\alpha}_{\max},$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{\max} := \max_{x \in V} \hat{\alpha}_x$. Hence, each of the random variables $\tau_1, \tau_2 - \tau'_1, \dots, \tau_{m+1} - \tau'_m$ stochastically dominates an exponential random variable with rate $c_{\max} k \hat{\alpha}_{\max}$. Thus, letting $\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*, \dots$ be some i.i.d. exponentials of rate $c_{\max} k \hat{\alpha}_{\max}$, by Markovianity we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\tau_{m+1} \leq t + \delta] &\leq \mathbb{P} [\tau_1^* + \dots + \tau_{m+1}^* \leq t + \delta] \\ &= \mathbb{P} [\text{Gamma}(m + 1, c_{\max} k \hat{\alpha}_{\max}) \leq t + \delta] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where $\text{Gamma}(u, \beta)$ denotes the Gamma distribution with shape $u > 0$ and rate $\beta > 0$. Therefore, by (A.9), (A.10) and (A.11), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [T_\varepsilon(t + \delta) \leq t] &\leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{m^2 C \varepsilon \log k}{\delta c_{\min}} \\ &\quad + \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} [\text{Gamma}(m + 1, c_{\max} k \hat{\alpha}_{\max}) \leq t + \delta] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

Lemma A.4. *We have*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\xi \in \Omega_k} \mathbb{P}_\xi^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Delta_k} < 3\delta] = 0.$$

Proof. As explained in the proof of Lemma A.3, starting from any $\xi \in \Omega_k$, τ_{Δ_k} stochastically dominates an exponential random variable of rate $c_{\max} k \hat{\alpha}_{\max}$. Thus, we get

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} \mathbb{P}_\xi^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Delta_k} < 3\delta] \leq \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left(1 - e^{-c_{\max} k \hat{\alpha}_{\max} 3\delta} \right) = 0.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Now, we are ready to prove Proposition A.1.

Proof of Proposition A.1. We prove

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\eta^\varepsilon(t) \in \Omega_k] = 1, \quad t > 0, \quad \eta \in \Xi_k. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

We follow the proof ideas of [LLM18, Lemma 3.1]. By (A.8), for $\delta \in (0, t/3)$, we estimate

$$1 = \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\eta^\varepsilon(S_\varepsilon(t-3\delta)) \in \Omega_k] \leq \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\eta^\varepsilon(S_\varepsilon(t-3\delta)) \in \Omega_k, S_\varepsilon(t-3\delta) \in [t-3\delta, t-2\delta]] \\ + \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [S_\varepsilon(t-3\delta) > t-2\delta].$$

By Lemma A.3, the second probability in the right-hand side vanishes as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, by (A.8), the first probability in the right-hand side is bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\exists s \in [t-3\delta, t-2\delta], \eta^\varepsilon(s) \in \Omega_k].$$

We can further divide this into two events and bound the last probability as

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\eta^\varepsilon(t) \in \Omega_k] + \mathbb{P}_\eta^\varepsilon [\exists s \in [t-3\delta, t-2\delta], \eta^\varepsilon(s) \in \Omega_k, \eta^\varepsilon(t) \in \Delta_k].$$

Then, by the Markov property, the second probability above is bounded by

$$\sup_{\xi \in \Omega_k} \mathbb{P}_\xi^\varepsilon [\tau_{\Delta_k} < 3\delta],$$

which, by Lemma A.4, vanishes by first taking the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and then $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Collecting all displayed inequalities, we conclude that (A.12) holds. \square

APPENDIX B. REVERSIBILITY OF THE LIMIT PROCESS

In this appendix, we prove Lemma 5.7 and simply write $\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k} = \varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k,m}$, $k \geq m$.

Proof of Lemma 5.7. We start by introducing an auxiliary continuous-time Markov chain on Ξ_k with rate function (cf. (5.1)–(5.3))

$$\mathbf{s}(\eta, \cdot) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^A(\eta, \cdot) & \text{if } \eta \in \Omega_k, \\ \mathbf{r}_k^B(\eta, \cdot) & \text{if } \eta \in \Delta_k. \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

In words, the above dynamics follows the rule of $A_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ in Ω_k , while that of B_k in Δ_k . (Remark that this is not a SIP-dynamics.) Now, recall the definition of $\Omega_{k,m}$ from (5.8) and, similarly, introduce the set

$$\Delta_{k,m} := \{\zeta \in \Delta_k : |\{x \in V : \zeta_x > 0\}| = m\}.$$

Observe that this auxiliary chain can jump from $\Omega_{k,m}$ to either $\Delta_{k,m}$ or $\Delta_{k,m+1}$ (if $m \leq k-1$), but a jump from $\Omega_{k,m}$ to $\Delta_{k,m}$ has rate zero to backtrack.

Now, fix $m \leq k-1$. We claim that this dynamics, restricted to $\Omega_{k,m} \cup \Delta_{k,m+1}$, is reversible with respect to $\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}$. For this purpose, it suffices to consider pairs $\eta, \xi = \eta - \delta_x + \delta_y \in \Omega_{k,m} \cup \Delta_{k,m+1}$ (hence, $\eta_x \geq 1$); rates are zero otherwise. If $\eta \in \Omega_{k,m}$ and $\xi \in \Omega_{k,m}$ (such that $\eta_x = 1$), then

$$\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\eta) \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^A(\eta, \xi) = c_{xy} \eta_x \hat{\alpha}_y \prod_{\substack{z \in V \\ \eta_z > 0}} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_z}{\eta_z} = c_{xy} \hat{\alpha}_x \xi_y \prod_{\substack{z \in V \\ \xi_z > 0}} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_z}{\xi_z} = \varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi) \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^A(\xi, \eta).$$

If $\eta \in \Omega_{k,m}$ and $\xi \in \Delta_{k,m+1}$ (such that $\eta_x \geq 2$), we have

$$\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\eta) \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^A(\eta, \xi) = c_{xy} \eta_x \hat{\alpha}_y \prod_{\substack{z \in V \\ \eta_z > 0}} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_z}{\eta_z} = c_{xy} \xi_x \xi_y \prod_{\substack{z \in V \\ \xi_z > 0}} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_z}{\xi_z} = \varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi) \mathbf{r}_k^B(\xi, \eta).$$

If $\eta, \xi \in \Delta_{k,m+1}$, we have

$$\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\eta) \mathbf{r}_k^{\mathcal{B}}(\eta, \xi) = c_{xy} \eta_x \eta_y \prod_{\substack{z \in V \\ \eta_z > 0}} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_z}{\eta_z} = c_{xy} \xi_x \xi_y \prod_{\substack{z \in V \\ \xi_z > 0}} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_z}{\xi_z} = \varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi) \mathbf{r}_k^{\mathcal{B}}(\xi, \eta).$$

This shows that $\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}$ is reversible for the Markov chain described in (B.1), restricted to $\Omega_{k,m} \cup \Delta_{k,m+1}$. Furthermore, by (5.7), we have, for all distinct $\eta, \xi \in \Omega_{k,m}$,

$$\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\eta) \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\eta, \xi) = \varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\eta) \sum_{\zeta \in \Delta_{k,m+1}} \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{A}}(\eta, \zeta) \mathbf{P}_{\zeta}^{\mathcal{B}}[\tau_{\xi} = \tau_{\Omega_k}].$$

Following $(\mathcal{B}_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$, from $\zeta \in \Delta_{k,m+1}$ to arrive at $\xi \in \Omega_{k,m}$, the trajectory must stay in $\Delta_{k,m+1}$. Thus, by reversibility, the right-hand side is equal to

$$\varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi) \sum_{\zeta \in \Delta_{k,m+1}} \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{A}}(\xi, \zeta) \mathbf{P}_{\zeta}^{\mathcal{B}}[\tau_{\eta} = \tau_{\Omega_k}] = \varsigma_{\hat{\alpha},k}(\xi) \mathbf{r}_{\hat{\alpha},k}^{\mathcal{M}}(\xi, \eta).$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Acknowledgement. The authors wish to thank Pietro Caputo, Matteo Quattropani, Justin Salez and Gunter Schütz, for fruitful conversations on various aspects of this work. The authors thank MIGE (Trieste), LMRS (Rouen) and IMPA (Rio de Janeiro) for the warm hospitality during their stays. SK was supported by KIAS Individual Grant (HP095101) at Korea Institute for Advanced Study. FS was supported by Microgrants 2022 (Regione FVG, legge LR 2/2011), and was a member of GNAMPA, INdAM, and of the PRIN project TESEO (2022HSSYPN).

REFERENCES

- [ADHR94] Francisco C. Alcaraz, Michel Droz, Malte Henkel, and Vladimir Rittenberg. Reaction-diffusion processes, critical dynamics, and quantum chains. *Ann. Physics*, 230(2):250–302, 1994.
- [AF02] David Aldous and James Allen Fill. Reversible Markov Chains and Random Walks on Graphs, 2002. Unfinished monograph, recomplied 2014, available at <https://www.stat.berkeley.edu/users/aldous/RWG/book.pdf>.
- [BC24] Alexandre Bristiel and Pietro Caputo. Entropy inequalities for random walks and permutations. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 60(1):54–81, 2024.
- [BDG17] Alessandra Bianchi, Sander Dommers, and Cristian Giardinà. Metastability in the reversible inclusion process. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 22:Paper No. 70, 34, 2017.
- [BH15] Anton Bovier and Frank den Hollander. *Metastability*, volume 351 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, Cham, 2015. A potential-theoretic approach.
- [Cap08] Pietro Caputo. On the spectral gap of the Kac walk and other binary collision processes. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 4:205–222, 2008.
- [CCL03] E. A. Carlen, M. C. Carvalho, and M. Loss. Determination of the spectral gap for Kac’s master equation and related stochastic evolution. *Acta Math.*, 191(1):1–54, 2003.
- [CGGR13] Gioia Carinci, Cristian Giardinà, Claudio Giberti, and Frank Redig. Duality for stochastic models of transport. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 152(4):657–697, 2013.
- [CLL20] Pietro Caputo, Cyril Labbé, and Hubert Lacoïn. Mixing time of the adjacent walk on the simplex. *Ann. Probab.*, 48(5):2449–2493, 2020.
- [CLR10] Pietro Caputo, Thomas M. Liggett, and Thomas Richthammer. Proof of Aldous’ spectral gap conjecture. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 23(3):831–851, 2010.
- [Cor23] Josué Corujo. On the spectrum of a neutral multi-allelic Moran model. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 20(1):505–546, 2023.
- [Cox89] J. T. Cox. Coalescing random walks and voter model consensus times on the torus in \mathbf{Z}^d . *Ann. Probab.*, 17(4):1333–1366, 1989.
- [DEHP93] B. Derrida, M. R. Evans, V. Hakim, and V. Pasquier. Exact solution of a 1D asymmetric exclusion model using a matrix formulation. *J. Phys. A*, 26(7):1493–1517, 1993.
- [DMFG24] Anna De Masi, Pablo A. Ferrari, and Davide Gabrielli. Hidden Temperature in the KMP Model. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 191(11):Paper No. 150, 2024.

- [DMP91] Anna De Masi and Errico Presutti. *Mathematical methods for hydrodynamic limits*, volume 1501 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [DSC93] Persi Diaconis and Laurent Saloff-Coste. Comparison theorems for reversible Markov chains. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 3(3):696–730, 1993.
- [Dur24] Rick Durrett. Dynamics on Graphs, 2024. unpublished monograph, version of the 16th of April 2024, available at <https://services.math.duke.edu/~rtd/DoG/DoG.html>.
- [EK86] Stewart N. Ethier and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Markov processes. Characterization and convergence*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1986.
- [FFG23] Chiara Franceschini, Rouven Frassek, and Cristian Giardinà. Integrable heat conduction model. *J. Math. Phys.*, 64(4):Paper No. 043304, 21, 2023.
- [FGK20] Rouven Frassek, Cristian Giardinà, and Jorge Kurchan. Duality and hidden equilibrium in transport models. *SciPost Phys.*, 9(4):Paper No. 054, 18, 2020.
- [FGS22] Chiara Franceschini, Patrícia Gonçalves, and Federico Sau. Symmetric inclusion process with slow boundary: hydrodynamics and hydrostatics. *Bernoulli*, 28(2):1340–1381, 2022.
- [FRS22] Simone Floreani, Frank Redig, and Federico Sau. Orthogonal polynomial duality of boundary driven particle systems and non-equilibrium correlations. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 58(1):220–247, 2022.
- [GKR07] Cristian Giardinà, Jorge Kurchan, and Frank Redig. Duality and exact correlations for a model of heat conduction. *J. Math. Phys.*, 48(3):033301, 15, 2007.
- [GKRV09] Cristian Giardinà, Jorge Kurchan, Frank Redig, and Kiamars Vafayi. Duality and hidden symmetries in interacting particle systems. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 135(1):25–55, 2009.
- [GRT24] Cristian Giardinà, Frank Redig, and Berend van Tol. Intertwining and propagation of mixtures for generalized KMP models and harmonic models. *arXiv:2406.01160*, 2024.
- [GRV13] Stefan Grosskinsky, Frank Redig, and Kiamars Vafayi. Dynamics of condensation in the symmetric inclusion process. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:no. 66, 23, 2013.
- [Her23] Jonathan Hermon. Relaxation times are stationary hitting times of large sets. *arXiv:2304.05878*, 2023.
- [Kac56] M. Kac. Foundations of kinetic theory. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1954–1955, vol. III*, pages 171–197. Univ. California Press, Berkeley-Los Angeles, Calif., 1956.
- [Kim21] Seonwoo Kim. Second time scale of the metastability of reversible inclusion processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 180(3-4):1135–1187, 2021.
- [Kim23] Seonwoo Kim. Hierarchical structure of metastability in the reversible inclusion process: third time scale and complete characterization. *arXiv:2308.13842*, 2023.
- [KL99] Claude Kipnis and Claudio Landim. *Scaling limits of interacting particle systems*, volume 320 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [KLS10] Roelf Koekoek, Peter A. Lesky, and René F. Swarttouw. *Hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials and their q-analogues*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010. With a foreword by Tom H. Koornwinder.
- [KMP82] C. Kipnis, C. Marchioro, and E. Presutti. Heat flow in an exactly solvable model. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 27(1):65–74, 1982.
- [KS21] Seonwoo Kim and Insuk Seo. Condensation and metastable behavior of non-reversible inclusion processes. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 382(2):1343–1401, 2021.
- [KS24] Seonwoo Kim and Federico Sau. Spectral gap of the symmetric inclusion process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 34(5):4899–4920, 2024.
- [Kur73] Thomas G. Kurtz. A limit theorem for perturbed operator semigroups with applications to random evolutions. *J. Functional Analysis*, 12:55–67, 1973.
- [LLM18] Claudio Landim, Michail Loulakis, and Mustapha Mourragui. Metastable Markov chains: from the convergence of the trace to the convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 23:Paper No. 95, 34, 2018.
- [LP17] David A. Levin and Yuval Peres. *Markov chains and mixing times*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017. Second edition of [MR2466937], with contributions by Elizabeth L. Wilmer, with a chapter on “Coupling from the past” by James G. Propp and David B. Wilson.
- [MT06] Ravi Montenegro and Prasad Tetali. Mathematical aspects of mixing times in Markov chains. *Found. Trends Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 1(3):x+121, 2006.
- [PR23] Richard Pymar and Nicolás Rivera. Mixing of the symmetric beta-binomial splitting process on arbitrary graphs. *arXiv:2307.02406*, 2023.

- [QS23] Matteo Quattropiani and Federico Sau. Mixing of the averaging process and its discrete dual on finite-dimensional geometries. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33(2):936–971, 2023.
- [RS18] Frank Redig and Federico Sau. Factorized duality, stationary product measures and generating functions. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 172(4):980–1008, 2018.
- [Sal23] Justin Salez. Universality of cutoff for exclusion with reservoirs. *Ann. Probab.*, 51(2):478–494, 2023.
- [Sal24] Justin Salez. Spectral gap and curvature of monotone Markov chains. *Ann. Probab.*, 52(3):1153–1161, 2024.
- [Sas15] Makiko Sasada. Spectral gap for stochastic energy exchange model with nonuniformly positive rate function. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(4):1663–1711, 2015.
- [SC97] Laurent Saloff-Coste. Lectures on finite Markov chains. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1996)*, volume 1665 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 301–413. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [Sch01] G. M. Schütz. Exactly solvable models for many-body systems far from equilibrium. In *Phase transitions and critical phenomena, Vol. 19*, pages 1–251. Academic Press, San Diego, CA, 2001.
- [Shi77] Norio Shimakura. Équations différentielles provenant de la génétique des populations. *Tôhoku Math. J.*, 29(2):287–318, 1977.
- [Smi14] Aaron Smith. A Gibbs sampler on the n -simplex. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(1):114–130, 2014.
- [Spi70] Frank Spitzer. Interaction of Markov processes. *Advances in Math.*, 5:246–290 (1970), 1970.
- [Spo83] Herbert Spohn. Long range correlations for stochastic lattice gases in a nonequilibrium steady state. *J. Phys. A*, 16(18):4275–4291, 1983.
- [Spo91] Herbert Spohn. *Large scale dynamics of interacting particles*. Theoretical and Mathematical Physics. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1991.
- [WZ19] Feng-Yu Wang and Weiwei Zhang. Nash inequality for diffusion processes associated with Dirichlet distributions. *Front. Math. China*, 14(6):1317–1338, 2019.

JUNE E HUH CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL CHALLENGES, KOREA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY,
SEOUL, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Email address: seonwookim@kias.re.kr

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, INFORMATICA E GEOSCIENZE, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TRIESTE,
TRIESTE, ITALY

Email address: federico.sau@units.it